August 1994

Actual and Desired Attributes of Shared Decision-making as Viewed by School Board Chairpersons, Central Office Personnel, and Principals in the First Educational District of Tennessee

Donald A. Rogers
East Tennessee State University

Order Number 9502666

Actual and desired attributes of shared decision-making as viewed by school board chairpersons, central office personnel, and principals in the First Educational District of Tennessee

Rogers, Donald Allen, Ed.D.

East Tennessee State University, 1994

U·M·I
300 N. Zeeb Rd.
Ann Arbor, MI 48106

ACTUAL AND DESIRED ATTRIBUTES OF SHARED DECISION MAKING AS VIEWED BY SCHOOL BOARD CHAIRPERSONS, CENTRAL OFFICE PERSONNEL, AND PRINCIPALS IN THE FIRST EDUCATIONAL DISTRICT OF TENNESSEE

A Dissertation

Presented to

the Faculty of the Department of

Educational Leadership and Policy Analysis

East Tennessee State University

In Partial Fulfillment

of the Requirements for the Degree

Doctor of Education

---

by

Donald Allen Rogers

August 1994

APPROVAL

This is to certify that the Graduate Committee of

DONALD ALLEN ROGERS

met on the

25th day of April, 1994.

The committee read and examined his dissertation, supervised his defense of it in an oral examination, and decided to recommend that his study be submitted to the Graduate Council and the Associate Vice-President for Research and Dean, School of Graduate Studies, in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Doctor of Education in Administration and Supervision.

Chairman, Graduate Committee

Signed on behalf of the Graduate Council

Associate Vice-President for Research and Dean, School of Graduate Studies

ABSTRACT

ACTUAL AND DESIRED ATTRIBUTES OF SHARED DECISION MAKING AS VIEWED BY SCHOOL BOARD CHAIRPERSONS, CENTRAL OFFICE PERSONNEL, AND PRINCIPALS IN THE FIRST EDUCATIONAL DISTRICT OF TENNESSEE

by

Donald Allen Rogers

The purpose of this study was to identify actual and desired attributes of shared decision making by practicing school leaders in the First Educational District of Tennessee. This study examined the relationships between selected demographic variables, organizational decision-making areas, and the responses of school board chairpersons, central office personnel, and principals.

The research design included five research questions along with six null hypotheses testing the relationship between actual and desired attributes of shared decision making for each of the three positions of school leader. One hypothesis tested the demographic variables--gender, age, educational level, and years of professional educational experience--as related to the actual and desired attributes of shared decision making. The instrument used included 10 areas of common organizational decisions related to the school setting. The Shared Education Decision Survey (SEDS) had 92 questions, with each having a two-part (actual-desired) response.

A statistically significant difference ($p \leq .05$) for central office personnel was found in all 10 organizational decision-making areas testing actual compared to desired participation in shared decision making.

A statistically significant difference ($p \leq .05$) was found for principals in all 10 areas of organizational decision-making areas testing actual compared to desired participation in shared decision making.

The statistically significant difference ($p \leq .05$) for demographic variables by position and gender indicated eight areas of interest for principals and seven areas for central office personnel. The variable of age had significance ($p \leq .05$) in two areas for principals and three areas for central office personnel. The variable of educational level

held significance ($p \leq .05$) for the overall population in three areas but none for the individual positions. The demographic of experience at the level of significance ($p \leq .05$) was found in the central office personnel in one area of organizational decision making.

The nonparameter tests of Kruskal-Wallis, Mann-Whitney, and Wilcoxon were used to test the hypotheses.

INSTITUTIONAL REVIEW BOARD APPROVAL

This is to certify that the following study has been filed and approved by the Institutional Review Board of East Tennessee State University.

Title of Grant or Project Actual and Desired Attributes of Shared Decision Making as Viewed by School Board Chairpersons, Central Office Personnel, and Principals in the First Educational District of Tennessee

Principal Investigator Donald Allen Rogers

Department Educational Leadership and Policy Analysis

Date Submitted _____

Institutional Review Board, Chairman Anthony J. DeLuca

IN MEMORY OF

HERVEY, JEAN, AND GREG ROGERS

MY FATHER, MOTHER, AND BROTHER

DEDICATION

TO

MY WIFE, SHIRLEY

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

Sincere appreciation is extended to Dr. Donn W. Gresso, committee chairperson, for his encouragement, guidance, friendship, expertise, and willingness to provide feedback and assistance in a timely manner.

Appreciation is due Dr. W. Hal Knight for his expert analysis of the data and explanation of complex information. The other members of my committee who provided encouragement and advice were Dr. Robert L. McElrath and Dr. Cecil N. Blankenship. Special gratitude goes to Dr. Russell F. West for his tolerance, friendship, suggestions, and technical expertise.

Thanks are in order for Sharon Barnett for kindness, friendship, and administrative guidance; also thanks goes to Sarah Wilson, my typist, for her patience, skills, and support.

The support and encouragement I received from my colleagues in Unicoi County and Cohort III was nothing short of a divine blessing. I especially want to thank Mickey Hatcher, Becky Love, Brenda Hensley, Martha Davenport, Janie Snyder, Ron Wilcox, Anderson Pate, Bill Nuss, Gail Tilson, Marilyn Caldwell, and all the faculty and staff at Unicoi County Middle School. These wonderful people were there to cheer me on, pray for me, and push me when I needed help and support.

A special thanks goes to my wife, Shirley, the love of my life; my son, Richard; my daughter, Allison; my son-in-law, Randall; and especially to my new grandson, Brett Austin Adkins. I want to also thank my father-in-law and mother-in-law, D. H. and Ruth Ricker, for years of support and inspiration.

CONTENTS

Page

APPROVAL. ii

ABSTRACT. iii

INSTITUTIONAL REVIEW BOARD. v

DEDICATION. vi

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS vii

LIST OF TABLES. xiii

Chapter

1. INTRODUCTION 1

Statement of the Problem 8

Purpose of the Study 8

Significance of the Problem 9

Research Questions 9

Question 1 10

Question 2 10

Question 3 10

Question 4 11

Question 5 11

Limitations 11

Assumptions 12

Procedures 12

Definition of Terms 13

Organization of the Study 15

2. REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE 16

Introduction 16

Chapter Page

Decision Making 16

Domains of Decision Making 23

Shared Decision Making: Theory and Practice 27

Summary 41

3. METHODOLOGY AND PROCEDURES 43

Introduction 43

Methodology 44

Population 44

Instrument Development 45

Instrument Validity and Reliability . . . 46

Data Collection Procedures 47

Data Analysis 49

Hypothesis 1 50

Hypothesis 2 51

Hypothesis 3 51

Hypothesis 4 51

Hypothesis 5 51

Hypothesis 6 52

4. PRESENTATION OF DATA AND ANALYSIS OF FINDINGS 53

Overview 53

Population and Sample 55

Demographic Profile of Respondents 56

Gender 58

Age 58

Chapter Page

Educational Level 59

Years of Professional Educational Experience 59

Reliability 60

Analysis of Findings 60

Respondents' General Direction for Survey 64

Hypothesis 1 66

Hypothesis 2 67

Hypothesis 3 70

Hypothesis 4 71

Hypothesis 5 76

Hypothesis 6 80

Summary 106

5. SUMMARY, FINDINGS, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS 108

Introduction 108

Summary 108

Findings 109

Research Question 1 110

Research Question 2 110

Research Question 3 111

Research Question 4 112

Research Question 5 112

Conclusions 112

Recommendations 114

Page

REFERENCES 116

APPENDICES 123

A. MASTER PLAN FOR TENNESSEE SCHOOLS, 1990 . . 124

B. SURVEY INSTRUMENT 127

C. OVERALL MEANS BY POSITION FOR ACTUAL AND DESIRED AREAS 137

D. MANN-WHITNEY U TESTS PAIR-WISE COMPARISON . 140

E. MANN-WHITNEY U TESTS RESULTS BY GENDER . . . 145

F. KRUSKAL-WALLIS ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE RESULTS SHOWING DIFFERENCES IN ACTUAL AND DESIRED LEVELS OF PARTICIPATION FOR GROUPS BY AGE (AREAS WITHOUT SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCES) . 155

G. KRUSKAL-WALLIS ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE RESULTS SHOWING DIFFERENCES IN ACTUAL AND DESIRED LEVELS OF PARTICIPATION FOR GROUPS BY EDUCATIONAL LEVEL (AREAS WITHOUT SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCES) 185

H. KRUSKAL-WALLIS ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE RESULTS SHOWING DIFFERENCES IN ACTUAL AND DESIRED LEVELS OF PARTICIPATION FOR GROUPS BY EXPERIENCE (AREAS WITHOUT SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCES) 215

VITA 245

LIST OF TABLES

Table		Page
1.	RELIABILITY RESULTS ON THE SHARED EDUCATION DECISIONS SURVEY	48
2.	POPULATION AND SAMPLE RETURNS BY POSITION . .	56
3.	A DEMOGRAPHIC PROFILE OF THOSE RESPONDING TO THE SURVEY INCLUDING RESPONDENTS' GENDER, AGE, EDUCATIONAL BACKGROUND, AND YEARS OF EXPERIENCE	57
4.	SHARED EDUCATION DECISION SURVEY (SEDS), CRONBACH ALPHA RELIABILITY COEFFICIENTS FOR THE FIRST EDUCATIONAL DISTRICT OF TENNESSEE FOR THE 1993-94 SCHOOL YEAR . . .	61
5.	WILCOXON MATCHED-PAIRS SIGNED-RANKS TEST RESULTS OF SCHOOL BOARD CHAIRPERSONS AND THEIR RESPONSES OF ACTUAL AND DESIRED PARTICIPATION CONCERNING 10 ORGANIZATIONAL AREAS OF SHARED EDUCATIONAL DECISIONS . . .	68
6.	WILCOXON MATCHED-PAIRS SIGNED-RANKS TEST RESULTS OF CENTRAL OFFICE PERSONNEL AND THEIR RESPONSES OF ACTUAL AND DESIRED PARTICIPATION CONCERNING 10 ORGANIZATIONAL AREAS OF SHARED EDUCATIONAL DECISIONS . . .	69
7.	WILCOXON MATCHED-PAIRS SIGNED-RANKS TEST RESULTS OF PRINCIPALS AND THEIR RESPONSES OF ACTUAL AND DESIRED PARTICIPATION CONCERNING 10 ORGANIZATIONAL AREAS OF SHARED EDUCATIONAL DECISIONS	71
8.	KRUSKAL-WALLIS ONE-WAY ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE OF ORDINAL DATA AND THE LEVELS OF SIGNIFICANCE OF ACTUAL PARTICIPATION RESPONSES IN RELATION TO 10 ORGANIZATIONAL AREAS OF SHARED EDUCATIONAL DECISIONS BY PRINCIPALS, CENTRAL OFFICE PERSONNEL, AND SCHOOL BOARD CHAIRPERSONS SURVEYED	74
9.	MANN-WHITNEY U TEST RESULTS OF SIGNIFICANCE BY POSITION SURVEYED IN ORGANIZATIONAL AREAS FOUND TO BE SIGNIFICANT	75

Table | Page

10. KRUSKAL-WALLIS ONE-WAY ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE OF ORDINAL DATA AND THE LEVELS OF SIGNIFICANCE OF DESIRED PARTICIPATION RESPONSES IN RELATION TO 10 ORGANIZATIONAL AREAS OF SHARED EDUCATIONAL DECISIONS BY POSITIONS SURVEYED 78

11. MANN-WHITNEY U TEST RESULTS OF SIGNIFICANCE BY GROUP SURVEYED IN CATEGORIES FOUND TO BE SIGNIFICANT 79

12. MANN-WHITNEY U TESTS OF DIFFERENCES IN ACTUAL AND DESIRED LEVELS OF PARTICIPATION BY GENDER 82

13. MANN-WHITNEY U TEST RESULTS OF ORGANIZATIONAL AREAS WITH SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCES BY GENDER 85

14. KRUSKAL-WALLIS ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE RESULTS SHOWING SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCES IN ACTUAL AND DESIRED LEVELS OF PARTICIPATION FOR GROUPS BY AGE 91

15. MANN-WHITNEY U TEST RESULTS FOR SIGNIFICANCE FOR PRINCIPALS BY AGE 95

16. MANN-WHITNEY U TEST RESULTS FOR SIGNIFICANCE FOR CENTRAL OFFICE PERSONNEL BY AGE 98

17. KRUSKAL-WALLIS ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE RESULTS SHOWING SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCES IN ACTUAL AND DESIRED LEVELS OF PARTICIPATION FOR GROUPS BY EDUCATIONAL LEVEL 101

18. KRUSKAL-WALLIS ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE RESULTS SHOWING SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCES IN ACTUAL AND DESIRED LEVELS OF PARTICIPATION FOR GROUPS BY EXPERIENCE 103

19. MANN-WHITNEY U TEST RESULTS FOR SIGNIFICANCE FOR CENTRAL OFFICE PERSONNEL BY EXPERIENCE 105

CHAPTER 1

Introduction

The problems in American education are similar in many ways to those that have faced business in recent years. Business leaders have learned that, in order to take a leading position in the changing global marketplace, they must eliminate unnecessary layers of management, respond to customer demands, and adapt manufacturing processes to technological advances. Educators are being asked to confront these same challenges. Two key elements in business and educational philosophy are: people will support and take pride in what they help to create, and people want and need to be involved in the decisions that affect them (Rundell, 1992).

School reform discourse in the United States during the last 20 years has been dominated by a conservative agenda that has advocated for, or implicitly assumed, "top-down" prototypes for change (Goodman, 1994). Top-down decision making causes many educators to feel powerless. Complying with these decisions leaves educators feeling as though they are at the mercy of outside influences. The efforts to impact schools' effectiveness have not generated the improvements expected and needed. Nationwide, the profession is responding by engaging in the most comprehensive analysis and overhaul of its basic operating

structure since the behavioral science revolution of the 1950s and 1960s (National Commission of Excellence in Educational Administration, 1987). School leaders across the country are currently facing vociferous demands for change and improvement. As a result, policymakers are now dismantling reforms and returning decision making to local schools in the form of shared decision making.

Shared decision making is defined as a process of joint decision making by two or more parties. The amount of participation of any particular individual is the amount of perceived influence one has on the decision and plans agreed upon (Vroom & Yetton, 1973). In this decentralized form of organizational governance, decisions are made by those who know and care most about the quality of the education students receive--the principal, teachers, parents and citizens, and the students themselves (Marburger, 1985). Decision-making authority related to the following areas is being delegated: planning, policy, curriculum/instruction, pupil personnel, staff personnel, school/community relations, parental involvement, staff development, budget decisions, and plant management decisions (Ferrara & Repa, 1993). School site councils, composed of school staff, parents, and community leaders, are being established as the decision-making body (Valesky, Forsythe, & Hall, 1992).

Shared decision making is also referred to as school-based decision making, school-based decisions, site-based

decision making, collaborative decision making, participatory decision making, and group decision making. The term "shared decision making" will be used in this study and is defined as a decentralized form of organization in which decisions are made by those who know and care most about the quality of the education students receive--the school board chairpersons, the central office personnel, and the principals.

Educational change is also occurring in the state of Tennessee. The Tennessee State Department of Education has identified the implementation of shared decision making in Tennessee schools as a major goal (Valesky et al., 1992). The formal introduction of shared decision making in Tennessee occurred in November, 1990, when the Tennessee State Board of Education and the Tennessee State Department of Education began an attempt to reform public education. The Master Plan for Tennessee Schools: Preparing for the Twenty-First Century (Tennessee State Board of Education, 1990) called for the Tennessee state legislature to make shared decision making the rule rather than the exception in Tennessee schools by the year 1995. The funding part of the Master Plan is called the Better Education Program, which will target the goal of the implementation process, but exact specifics concerning the funding have not been made public. The strategies of school-based decision making are elaborated upon with the program. (See Appendix A.)

Tennessee superintendents have hesitated to implement shared decision making because they believe that principals are not receptive to the process (Valesky, Smith, & Fitzgerald, 1990). The role of the principal has been perceived as a "middle manager" between central office and school staff. If shared decision making implementation were to take place, the result would be an increase by principals in assuming responsibility for school operation and, possibly, a decrease in the principals' control. Principals would be required to be more responsive to their advisory councils. In effect, the superintendent-school board relationship is recreated at the local level between principal and advisory council (Belli & VanLingen, 1993). Etheridge and Hall (1991) expressed concern relative to the effectiveness of shared decision making impacting communication among central office personnel, superintendents, board chairpersons, principals, teachers, and parents to improve student learning. Members of the boards of education must be mindful they are representatives of all the people. School boards are finding it desirable to consult with principals, teachers, parents, and students in the planning of the future for the local educational system (Tennessee School Boards Association, 1988). School boards are legally required to set policies to impact the school environment. Recent research indicates that school boards' policy-setting authority will not be affected by

implementing shared decision making at the school site (Boschee, Uhl, & Bonaiuto, 1993). An effectively functioning school board requires team work and a spirit of shared responsibility from the school system governance team and the entire school community (American Association of School Administrators & National School Boards Association, 1984).

Central office personnel have traditionally made system-wide decisions that have direct and indirect influence on the school's environment. The direction of central office personnel will shift from the more traditional "being-a-resource" orientation to that of "leading and managing resources" (Snyder & Giella, 1988). The superintendent plays a central role in the implementation of shared decision making. Districts with a history of successfully decentralizing authority are characterized by strong superintendents who use training, hiring and evaluation criteria, and incentives to develop strong site managers, in this case, principals (David, 1989).

In the past, principals have been viewed as teachers with limited knowledge of administration. Today the principal is viewed as an administrative manager with limited knowledge of the technology of teaching (Richardson, 1988). Shared decision making requires a change in these perceived roles of principals. Shared decision making requires increased leadership in all areas from principals,

who must function like a chief executive officer at the school level (Guthrie, 1986).

Leadership skills for school principals are very difficult to isolate. The National Commission on Excellence in Educational Administration (1987) stressed the distinction between leadership skills (including persuasion, setting goals, developing community consensus) and managerial or supervisory skills. Although the latter are necessary, the Commission believed that school leaders must consistently develop leadership skills at the school and district level if reforms such as shared decision making are to be successful. Ultimately, they must determine the degree to which school-level authority is shared and how it is shared. One of the eight major goals for the Tennessee State Board of Education for the 21st century is implementation of school-based decision making in Tennessee public schools by the year 1995 (Tennessee State Board of Education, 1993).

Educational reformers view site councils as critical to the overall success of shared decision making. Shared decision making councils are usually created by the Board of Education in an attempt to decentralize operational responsibility. Councils cannot make board policy, but the councils can serve as the eyes and ears of the board and, thus, are uniquely able to interpret board policies based on their experiences because they have their own perspective of

the needs of the students in a particular school. The board and superintendent share not only operational responsibility, but also authority, information, accountability, and credit for jobs well done (Marburger, 1985).

Sometimes school-based management plans are ambiguous and are inconsistent with existing policies. As a result, it is difficult to determine what decision-making authority site participants have been given and how this authority differs from prior arrangements. The changing role of the school leader must keep this situation and many others under control to achieve any degree of success (Malen, Ogawa, & Kranz, 1990).

An understanding of the actual and desired attributes of shared decision making by school leaders, which includes the central office personnel, the school board chairperson, and the principals, should contribute to the success of this endeavor to improve schools. The actual and desired attributes identified by school board chairpersons, central office personnel, and principals from their respective viewpoints should have implications for the implementation of shared decision making. An understanding of each group's perspective will hopefully result in a consensus of attitudes to ensure that shared decision making contributes to improved learning. This study will investigate school leaders' perceptions regarding the actual and desired

attributes of shared decision making in the First Educational District of Tennessee.

Statement of the Problem

Research on certain aspects of shared decision making and its effects on the stakeholders is a contemporary issue, but research on the school board chairperson, central office personnel, and the principal regarding the actual practice and the desired attributes of shared decision making is lacking.

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study was to identify actual and desired attributes of shared decision making by practicing school leaders in the First Educational District of Tennessee. The review of the literature pertaining to shared decision making and the school leaders in the First Educational District of Tennessee failed to provide any significant information in this area. The Master Plan for Tennessee Schools (Tennessee State Board of Education, 1990) encouraged the implementation of shared decision making. There was a need to identify the actual and desired attributes that contribute to the process as perceived by the school leaders in the First Educational District of Tennessee.

Significance of the Problem

Many significant proposals are being recommended as citizens and legislators seek to hold educators accountable for improvements in the educational process. While accountability standards are increasing, the means for achieving those standards are increasingly being relegated to the school site through the shared decision-making process. The Master Plan for Tennessee Schools (Tennessee State Board of Education, 1990) encouraged the implementation of shared decision making.

School leaders in Tennessee are being charged with the responsibility of implementing shared decision making. Informed decisions should guide these efforts. This study should hopefully contribute to the making of informed decisions based on the perceptions of these leaders. The following areas which are encompassed by shared decision making were addressed in this study: planning, policy, curriculum/instruction, pupil personnel, staff personnel, school/community relations, parental involvement, staff development, budget decisions, and plant management.

Research Questions

The following research questions were posed in this study.

Question 1

What level of actual/desired participation in shared decision making has occurred in the following 10 categories--planning, policy, curriculum/instruction, pupil personnel, staff personnel, school/community, parental involvement, staff development, budget, and plant management--according to school board chairpersons in the First Educational District of Tennessee?

Question 2

What level of actual/desired participation in shared decision making has occurred in the following 10 categories--planning, policy, curriculum/instruction, pupil personnel, staff personnel, school/community, parental involvement, staff development, budget, and plant management--according to central office personnel in the First Educational District of Tennessee?

Question 3

What level of actual/desired participation in shared decision making has occurred in the following 10 categories--planning, policy, curriculum/instruction, pupil personnel, staff personnel, school/community, parental involvement, staff development, budget, and plant management--according to principals in the First Educational District of Tennessee?

Question 4

What differences are there in the actual and desired levels of implementation of shared decision making by the school board chairpersons, central office personnel, and principals in the First Educational District of Tennessee?

Question 5

Is there any difference between job description, age, sex, and/or educational level of school leaders and their perception of successful implementation of shared decision making in the First Educational District of Tennessee?

Limitations

The limitations of this study were:

1. The study was confined to the First Educational District of Tennessee.

2. The population consisted of 187 principals, 17 school board chairpersons, and 82 identified central office personnel in the First Educational District of Tennessee.

3. The study included 10 county and 7 city school systems (the entire population).

4. The literature review was conducted at the Charles C. Sherrod Library, East Tennessee State University, and the John C. Hodges Library at University of Tennessee, Knoxville. On-line as well as off-line searches in the areas of education and business were conducted.

Assumptions

1. There are specific demographic variables which can be compared to the shared education decisions survey, making the instrument appropriate for this study.

2. There should be aspects of shared decision making within all schools in the First Educational District of Tennessee.

3. The willingness of the participants to give careful, thoughtful, and truthful responses will be a determining factor.

Procedures

1. The investigator contacted the Tennessee Department of Education and requested a 1993-1994 roster of school leaders in the First Educational District of Tennessee.

2. The investigator received permission to use the survey instrument named Shared Education Decisions Survey (SEDS) from Committee Chairman, Dr. Donn Gresso, after he wrote a letter of request to Dr. Donna Ferrara. Dr. Ferrara gave permission if it were for research on a dissertation for educational purposes and she received information via an ASCII format of raw data file.

3. The investigator sent a cover letter, the survey, demographic data sheet, and a self-addressed, stamped envelope to all school board chairpersons, central office personnel (system-wide personnel), and principals in the First Educational District of Tennessee.

4. One week later, the investigator sent a follow-up letter reminding non-participants to return the school leader survey and demographic data sheet.

5. The investigator applied statistical procedures to the data.

6. The investigator reported and summarized the results.

Definition of Terms

Shared decision making is a decentralized form of organization, in which decisions are made by those who know and care most about the quality of education students receive--the principal, teachers, parents and citizens, and the students.themselves (Marburger, 1985, p. xi).

First Educational District of Tennessee is located in the northeastern area of the state and includes the county school systems of Carter, Cocke, Greene, Hamblen, Hancock, Hawkins, Johnson, Sullivan, Unicoi, and Washington. The District also includes the city school systems of Bristol, Elizabethton, Greeneville, Johnson City, Kingsport, Newport, and Rogersville (Tennessee State Department of Education, 1994).

School Principal is the person whose primary function is to exert educational leadership to improve the quality of life of each individual within the school. The principal must be viewed by the community, by the faculty, and by the

students as being primarily accountable for achieving this function (Knezevich, 1984).

Chairperson of the School Board is the person elected by fellow school board members to serve as chairperson or board president. The chairperson's job is to see that the meeting is run by the rules of order and bylaws that the board establishes. The chairperson is entitled to vote on all issues (National School Board Association, 1987).

Central Office Personnel are the rofessionals within a school district responsible for system-wide duties and includes the superintendent, all assistant superintendents, instructional supervisors, elementary and secondary supervisors, and supervisors of federal projects. The supervisory population was determined from the listing of system-wide personnel in the 1993-94 Directory of Public Schools (Tennessee State Department of Education, 1994).

Empowerment is a deliberate effort to provide principals and teachers with the room, right, responsibility, and resources to make sensible decisions and informed professional judgments that reflect their circumstances (Sergiovanni, 1990).

Perception is a direct or intuitive cognition, a capacity for comprehension, insight (Webster, 1991).

Educational Leadership can be defined by the four most common elements, which are as follows:

1. Empowering self and others

2. Transcending superficial understanding

3. Applying knowledge to practical problems

4. Making the future better than the present (Pajak, 1993).

Stakeholder is a person entrusted with an interest or share in an undertaking (Webster, 1991).

Organization of the Study

This study was organized into five chapters. Chapter 1 contains an introduction to the study, the statement of the problem, the purpose of the study, the significance of the problem, the research questions, the limitations, the assumptions, procedures, the definitions of relevant terms, and the organization of the study.

Chapter 2 presents a review of related literature.

Chapter 3 describes the methodology by which the study was conducted.

Chapter 4 contains statistical treatment of the data.

Chapter 5 includes the summary, findings, conclusions, and recommendations of the study.

CHAPTER 2

Review of Related Literature

Introduction

The review of related literature is divided into two parts. The first section deals with decision making, because a review of the historical perspective of decision making is a logical progression to shared decision making. This section addresses decision-making models and the domains of decision making as related to shared decision making.

The second section of this review of literature deals with shared decision making, theory, and practice. The foundations established by decision-making models are the current initiatives in the area of shared decision making in educational practice.

A summary closes the Review of Related Literature.

Decision Making

While the issue of participation in decision making is ageless, its roots are traceable to early writers such as Machiavelli and St. Benedict (Vroom & Jago, 1988). Its resurgence as a continuing theme in the academic world is dated in the 1930s. The Hawthorne experiments of Western Electric (1929-1945) and the work of Kurt Lewin and his disciples in the 1940s are often cited as early examples of

participation studies carried out in the workplace (Vroom & Jago, 1988).

Most of the early literature, however, on decision making was grounded in theory rather than in empirical research and largely evolved from the bodies of theory on bureaucracy, authority, and leadership, the result of viewing the school as a formal organization and as a decision-making structure. Decision making was variously viewed as a cycle of events by which an organization makes and implements decisions, a conscious selection of choice among alternatives (Hoy & Miskel, 1991), requiring the assignment of priorities to the alternatives and acting on information (Vroom & Yetton, 1973).

A simple approach to decision making was Simon's (1960) view that decision making is comprised of three principal phases: finding occasions for making a decision (intelligence activity); finding possible courses of action (design activity); and choosing a course of action (choice activity). These three stages approximated those first described by Dewey (1916): What is the problem? What are the alternatives? Which alternative is best? In Simon's (1960) schema, there were two polar types of decision: programmed, those which were repetitive, routine, and for which procedures existed; and nonprogrammed, those which were novel, unstructured, and complex. Programmed decisions were generally approached through habit and standard

operating procedures, whereas nonprogrammed decisions have tended to elude understanding. As a result, according to Simon, little theory existed to explain the phenomena surrounding nonprogrammed decisions.

According to Hoy and Miskel (1991), the theory on decision making could be divided into three main types: the classical model, the administrative model, and the incremental model. The classical model, regarded as an optimizing strategy, assumed that decisions should be completely rational and that all alternatives for the solution to a problem be identified and evaluated before the best alternative, the one maximizing goals and objectives, was selected and implemented.

The administrative model, or satisfying strategy, represented a more realistic approach to decision making, based on the complexity of most organizational problems and the limited potential to utilize an optimizing strategy consistently. This model was first introduced by Simon to provide a model which accurately described the way administrators do and should make organizational decisions. This strategy acknowledged that complete rationality in decision making was virtually impossible and focused on the selection and implementation of satisfactory alternatives rather than optimal alternatives (Hoy & Miskel, 1991).

The third model, the incremental model, or strategy of successive limited comparisons, had as its underlying

assumption that small incremental changes will not produce major unanticipated or undesirable consequences. This process did not require objectives or broad analysis of alternatives. Instead, a limited set of alternatives was considered by comparing consequences of each action until agreement was reached by decision makers. Good decisions were determined to be those in which decision makers could agree (Hoy & Miskel, 1991).

Other paradigms of decision making were derived from theory on leader behaviors. House's path-goal model, a contingency approach, identified four types of leader behaviors: the supportive, who considered needs of subordinates and created a positive climate; the directive, who gave direction and guidance and asked subordinates to follow rules and regulations; the participative, who consulted with subordinates and evaluated their opinions and suggestions when making decisions; and the achievement-oriented, who set challenging goals and standards for excellence and sought performance improvements (Hanson, 1991).

Fiedler's contingency approach model stated a group's performance was contingent upon the leader's motivational system and the degree to which the leader controlled and influenced the situation. In the model, Fiedler considered three contingency variables--group atmosphere, task structure, and the leader's position power. He devised the

least-preferred co-worker (LPC) scale to measure two different leadership styles: one, the task-oriented or initiating structure, and the other, the relationship-oriented, or consideration structure. There were two recognized problems with this model. One, the LPC was unidimensional and did not take into account that leaders can influence both task and the group atmosphere simultaneously. Secondly, Fiedler believed that it was easier to change a situation than to change one's leadership style (Hanson, 1991).

Vroom and Yetton (1973) proposed a more complicated model of leadership which included a set of guidelines for determining when and to what extent leaders should involve educators in decision making. Two sets of rules guided the process. The first set included three rules designed to enhance the quality of decisions. The second set of four rules was designed to enhance acceptance of decisions by subordinates. The amount of time required to make the decision was also considered as an influence on the outcome of the decision. Methods of making decisions were ordered along a continuum from unilateral to shared. The seven decision rules were considered contingency factors. In this paradigm, the method of making a decision was based on yes and no responses to each rule. A flow chart guided the decision maker through the process until a method of

decision making was arrived at based on condition of quality and acceptance surrounding the decision.

A fourth model was offered by Bridges (1967), who believed that educators should be involved in decisions which were relevant and in which they had expertise. The test for relevance was grounded in the extent to which subordinates had a personal stake in the decision. The test of expertise was grounded in the extent to which educators were qualified to make useful and meaningful contributions to the identification or the solution to the problem. This model was based on what Bridges termed zone of acceptance.

The Vroom and Yetton model, the Bridges model, and the House model were especially useful for school settings in that the leadership style used for one situation did not constrain the leader from using different methods or styles for other situations or decisions (Bridges, 1967; Hoy & Miskel, 1991; Vroom & Yetton, 1973). The Fiedler model assumed that the leadership style was relatively rigid and that the manager matched a situation to his or her leadership style. The Vroom and Yetton model allowed that managers could choose from among a variety of leadership styles, ranging from highly autocratic to highly participative. Bridges' model focused on involving subordinates in decision making when the personal stakes were high and the subordinates had the information or knowledge to contribute to identifying or solving a problem. From House's point of

view, managers focused on improving job satisfaction and performance of subordinates through the choice of four leadership styles. The manager's primary goal was to remove roadblocks that might stand in the way of success.

In a 3-year decision-making study of 232 elementary principals, Hemphill and others found through simulation exercises that there were two primary means by which the principals dealt with problems in the school setting (Hoy & Miskel, 1991). One group tended to stress preparation for action, and the other group put its emphasis on the actual work surrounding the problem solving. The more effective principals stressed the preparation phase. The researchers concluded that these findings supported the use of an administrative decision-making cycle.

One problem involved in implementing decision-making models in the school setting was that their process and structure could not merely be lifted from other types of organizations. It was noted that decision-making processes as they apply to educational organizations looked and operated differently under different conditions. Emphasis in decision-making models in school settings had been on situational characteristics: how each model helped to identify different aspects and applications of decision-making processes (Bolman & Deal, 1984; Elmore, 1978; Peterson, 1976; Vroom & Yetton, 1973).

Because of the broad continuum for decision making represented by the Vroom and Yetton model, the characteristic of being a contingency approach, and recognition of the systemic quality of school settings, this model was considered the most appropriate for this study.

Domains of Decision Making

One structure for viewing decisional areas in the school setting has been in terms of "domains." A variety of studies in the last 30 years have investigated the multidimensional nature of decisions within the school setting, attempting to provide classifications into domains of decision making. Much of the empirical work has been based on Parsons (1958), who developed a general theory of organization in which he classified decisions into three systems: technical (teachers), managerial (building principals), and institutional (the superintendent and central office staff). Technical decisions directly related to the productive operation of the organization. Managerial decisions related to such issues as acquisition, use, and disposition of resources. The institutional decisions related to organizational adaptation to the larger social system (Mohrman, Cooke, & Mohrman, 1978).

Anthony (1964) also identified three domains--technical, managerial, and strategic. Anthony's three domains paralleled the theoretical work of Parsons. Katz and Kahn (1966) isolated a somewhat more detailed set of

five subsystems, which they named production, maintenance, boundary, adaptive, and managerial. While the findings of the three early studies differed in certain respects, they all suggested that participation may be differentially appropriate depending on the organizational subsystem which represents the decisional situation (Mohrman et al., 1978).

Other early work identified two domains--technical and managerial (Best, 1975; Conway, 1976). Consistently throughout this body of research, the technical domain tended to include decisions related to curriculum, instruction, and pupil-related issues; and the managerial domain tended to include decisions related to budget, hiring, facilities, and work assignments.

Mohrman et al. (1978), utilizing the discrepancy model of Alutto and Belasco (1972) as well as their 12 decisional situations, measured actual and desired deprivation and identified two dominant domains, managerial and technical, as well as a weak third factor which they named "negotiation."

Ho (1982) identified three domains: technical, managerial, and professional. The professional domain contained 24 items which fell between the managerial and technical categories.

Stuckwisch (1986), in his study of 29 Virginia public high schools, found three domains--professional, instructional, and managerial--although, as contrasted with

past studies, there was some reassignment of items to different domains.

In their study of 1,789 respondents from the National Education Association membership file, Bacharach, Bauer, and Shedd (1986) found that most educators felt that they should have considerably more opportunity for involvement in decision making. Hardly any respondents reported saturation, and some educators reported their present level of decision making as sufficient. Sixty-three percent (63%) wanted more participation in organizational policies such as staff hiring, standardized testing policies, budget development and expenditures, and also planning use of facilities. Concerning decisions related to educator-student interface, such as student rights, discipline codes, and grading policies, over 67% reported wanting more opportunity to participate. In the area of staff evaluation and staff development, 70% reported wanting more involvement. Over 55% of the educators reported wanting more involvement in work allocation decisions, such as school, grade-level, and subject-level assignments. In the area of teaching process, which included what and how to teach and texts available and used, approximately 50% of the respondents wanted more decisional involvement (Bacharach et al., 1986).

In their study of 1,531 educators, nationwide, Bacharach, Bamberger, Conley, and Bauer (1990) identified

four domains on 19 decisional areas. Their typology, however, differed from prior typologies. The research strategy was to hypothesize four domains based on a matrix of technical and managerial decisions which might be organizational or individual/personal in nature. They named the technical area operational and the managerial area strategic. Through use of factor analysis, they supported the typology of four domains of decision making: operational-organizational, operational-personal, strategic-organizational, and strategic-personal. While there were some differential results for elementary and secondary schools, in general, findings were consistent. The operational-organizational domain included such items as student rights and discipline; grading, reporting, and text policies; and evaluation performance. The operational-personal domain contained books available and used and what and how to teach. The strategic-organizational domain contained facilities, budget development, expenditure, and hiring items. The strategic-personal domain contained student removal and school, class, and student assignment.

In a recent study of the relationships between educator perceptions of their participation in decision making and their behavior, Musco (1992) identified three factors for extent of participation reported. The managerial factor described sharing in decisions related to administration and personnel. The programmatic factor described decisions

relating to established goals and general policies of the school. The technical factor involved decisions related to instruction in the educators' own subject classes.

Research has underscored the need for rigorous methodology concerning the study of patterns of decision making. Bacharach et al. (1990) reported that continuing work was needed in the area of domains and that, additionally, the study of domains must contain a methodology which included deviation scores as a basis for further analysis, as well as a conceptual framework that viewed decision making as a multidimensional construct.

Shared Decision Making: Theory and Practice

The conceptual derivations for participation in decision making come from the same body as that of leadership theory. Based on his work on leadership, Bridges (1967) postulated that educator participation was more effective when the administrator involved teachers in making decisions clearly outside their zone of acceptance. That was, if there was a high personal stake for teachers (relevance) and teachers had the qualifications to make a contribution to identifying or solving a problem (expertise), administrators should involve teachers in the decision.

Vroom and Yetton's contingency model (1973) was also cited in the literature on participation in decision making as a paradigm. Vroom and Yetton stated the extent to which

educators participated in decisions should depend on the nature of the problem and the situation. The extent of participation occurred along a continuum with five alternative methods of decision making: the administrator acted unilaterally, using already existing information without consultation; the administrator sought information without the subordinate knowing the reason and acted alone; the administrator consulted with relevant subordinates and acted, with the decision possibly but not necessarily reflecting input; the administrator consulted with a group or groups and acted, with the decision possibly but not necessarily reflecting input; and the administrator shared the situation and problem with a group and the group decided, with all sharing equally in the decision (Vroom & Yetton, 1973).

Swanson's model reduced the methods of involving others in decisions to three (Hoy & Miskel, 1991). One was a democratic-centralist arrangement, where the leader got input from subordinates and the leader made the decision. The second was the parliamentarian arrangement, where all members including the subordinates and the leader had equal votes and the majority ruled. The third was the participant-determining arrangement, where consensus was required, with all having equal votes.

While it was not a perfect model, the Vroom and Yetton continuum best represented the way in which decisions tended

to be actually made in the school setting. Additionally, decision making in the school setting tended to be more complex than characterized by Bridges and Swanson.

Because of the derivative nature of the theory on decision making, more recent researchers believed that no original strong theory could be offered for shared decision making in and of itself and that, in effect, shared decision making was less a theory and more a predication of a series of beliefs and/or assumptions; that schools should be the object arenas for educational improvement, change, and renewal; that the school should be in the site of professional inquiry and reflective practice; that decision making and renewal should focus on the individual school; that educators must be involved at school sites in the process of regeneration; and that advantage must be taken of the knowledge and skills of all at the school site (Sirotnik & Clark, 1988).

Rationales for shared decision making were also generally approached from the standpoint of assumptions: (a) persons who participated in decisions which affected them would have a higher degree of commitment to the successful outcome of those decisions; (b) the higher level of commitment would result in better education; (c) educators who were in the classroom every day often had a clearer understanding of instructional needs than did other educators; and (d) this better understanding could be

applied to raise productivity and thus the achievement level of the students (Kerr, 1991).

Other assumptions appearing in the literature included the following: (a) the degree to which a school was integrated into the power, status, and authority structure of a school system was an important determinant of the extent to which the school would positively respond to a centrally initiated innovative effort; (b) the strategies by which an innovation was introduced into a school building were sensitive to and varied according to the organizational context of the school; amd (c) the likelihood that a school would respond to a system-initiated innovation in a way that fostered the adaptation of the innovation to building concerns was likely to be increased if the faculty had prior experience with collective problem-solving and shared decision making (Joslin, 1982).

While a growing body of literature on shared decision making in the educational setting could be traced back to the 1950s, the bulk of the decision-making literature was relatively recent and spanned the decades of the 1970s and the 1980s. Recent reviews of the research results on participatory decision making were inconclusive with considerable variability (Locke & Schweiger, 1979; Schweiger & Leana, 1986; Yuhl, 1981; all cited in Vroom & Jago, 1988). The conclusion of Schweiger and Leana was that no single approach of leadership style could be used with all

participants for all types of activities (Vroom & Jago, 1988, p. 13).

By the 1980s, not much ground had been gained in introducing participative models into the school setting. The teacher was even being viewed as having lost much authority to make decisions--to supervisors, to their own organizations, and to federal, state, and local mandates (Ravitch, 1984).

Faced in the 1990s with economic challenges in industry and declining productivity, achievement, and morale in the school setting, one of the strategies proposed for increased worker involvement is increased participation. Simplistic solutions, however, according to Vroom and Jago (1988) were not the answer. The answer lay in understanding the processes by which shared decision making worked and situations which affected those processes.

Despite consensus on the importance of shared decision making, attempts to define shared decision making and participative decision making had not resulted in consensus on what it was (Conley, 1991). According to Conley, work on participation had produced more a set of strategic choices than a definition. If one focused on the authority structure of schools and political perspectives, the definition would contain two dimensions: (a) who participates, and (b) the types of decisions in which members participate (Conley, 1991). If the definition was

viewed from the paradigms of Alutto and Belasco (1972) and Bridges (1967), a dichotomous choice evolved, that between joint decision making and delegation. Vroom and Yetton's (1973) model allowed for a more detailed continuum of choice, from the administrator acting autonomously to the administrator delegating the decision to the educator or educators. Even this paradigm had inherent in it a power which rested in the administrator. Firestone and Corbett described participation as "formal opportunities for teachers to be present during the process of making decisions about school improvement" (Firestone & Corbett, 1988, p. 332).

Another major problem surrounding the topic of shared decision making was not only providing a definition of it but extending the inquiry into determining what was meant by the practice itself. Educator participation in decision making still seemed reserved for the more traditional vehicles: departmental structures, faculty meeting, ad hoc committees, and team-teaching assignments (Conley, Schmidle, & Shedd, 1988). Findings on the present state of the practice on shared decision making generally concluded that the practice had been less institutionalized than one might have been led to believe and that educators were dissatisfied with the degree of authority they possessed in the workplace. Sprott (1983) found in her 3-year study of one urban elementary school no changes after the

establishment of a planning team comprised of the principal, teacher, and parents; while the planning team carried out all its tasks, she concluded that this gave only the illusion of school reform. She also found that the illusion of power caused educators to have ambivalent feelings about the project.

Proponents of shared decision making supported the concept that the key policy decisions must be made at the local level and that there must be increased decision making by the stakeholders at the school site, as well as opportunities to enhance ownership (Kirst, 1977). The underlying belief was that successful change initiatives required involvement by those who would be affected by the change (Mann, 1978; Vroom & Jago, 1988; Vroom & Yetton, 1973) and that decisions would be better if they were made after consulting those who would be affected by the decision. The organization of local councils which included administrators, teachers, parents, and community members came to be viewed as necessary for a representative blending of priorities and objectives to provide a common ground for school reform and school action (Plath & Perry, 1977). The research on this belief was inconclusive; however, primary research and reviews of research related specifically to the relationship between participation and decision outcomes noted ambiguity or lack of support for some hypotheses (Giacquinta, 1973) and variability of results (Locke &

Schweiger, 1979; Schweiger & Leana, 1986; Yuhl, 1981; all cited in Vroom & Jago, 1988). Some research findings tended to confirm that ratings of effectiveness and excellence were associated with participative systems and that stakeholders tended to be most satisfied in shared decision-making participative schools (Conley, 1991).

Certain conditions or preconditions must be present for a change effort such as shared decision making to be implemented and to succeed: a cooperative spirit must be present in the system; constituents must be able to talk and work together; there must be a desire to improve; and there must be a genuine willingness to implement the plan (Plath & Perry, 1977). The power structure must be realigned so that increased professional autonomy can occur for the teacher (Guthrie & Craig, 1976).

Strategic questions must be answered before new forms of participation can be structured: In which decisions will what professional become involved? Who will make what decisions in school-site management? What are the basic tasks of administrators and teachers in the context of decentralized decision making? What is the role of teacher unions in school-site management (Conley & Bacharach, 1990)? While success for school-site management depends on the specific relationships between the stakeholders, educational leaders were admonished that they lacked specifications for how this would occur (Conley & Bacharach, 1990). Even as

educational leaders are led in the direction of putting decisions which directly affect them in the hands of teachers, educational leaders have no definitive research indicating the decisions that they perceive are important to teachers.

One recent statewide study focused on addressing both the general change process as well as the specific process of shared decision making. Recommendations included the inclusion of process and content factors which create an environment that enhances change initiatives. These recommendations included identifying and demonstrating data showing a need for change, increasing awareness of the need to change through research, using staff surveys to determine readiness of individuals, providing educators practice in team-building skills, and sharing decisions. Findings imply changes in decision-making procedures must be accompanied by a dramatic change in the system's traditional administrative role and policy-making procedures. Shared decision making is a characteristic of the decentralization movement. Highly centralized structures simply do not engender the desired improvements educationally. Understanding the basic concept of shared decision making and understanding the impact of shared decision making by the stakeholders will enhance the chances of its success and will affect decisions made by those involved. One of the major impacts of shared decision making is that the roles of all participants are

affected, to a degree. The school board's role does not change as much as other participants; however, its support is essential (Haywood, 1992).

The most serious threat to the issue of moving decisions to site bases and collaboratively into the hands of the stakeholders is that this decentralizing of decision making will be viewed as an end in itself, rather than as a piece of an overall strategy to raise student success (O'Neil, 1990).

One approach in the study of patterns of shared decision making has been to investigate decision situations (Alutto & Belasco, 1972; Bacharach et al., 1986; Bacharach et al., 1990; Best, 1975; Mohrman et al., 1978). Some of the models have been non-evaluative (studying what was occurring or what was desired), and a few have been evaluative (investigating within the same study both occurrence and desire and generating discrepancy measures) (Alutto & Balasco, 1972; Bacharach et al., 1986; Bacharach et al., 1990; Conley et al., 1988; Mohrman et al., 1978). Even those few studies which have been evaluative do not always report actual, desired, and difference results. Instead, they utilize the difference, or deviation scores, for other analyses and report only these deviation results. Still, the fact that educators tended to report deprivation more than any other condition leads one to conclude more participation was desired.

Alutto and Belasco's (1972) work measured actual and preferred involvement in organizational decision making. They constructed a list of 12 decisional areas, including hiring faculty members, selecting instructional texts, resolving student problems, determining instructional methods and techniques, establishing instructional policies, establishing classroom disciplinary policies, planning school budgets, determining faculty assignments, resolving faculty grievances, planning buildings and facilities, resolving problems with community groups, and determining faculty salaries. Respondents gave yes and no responses to whether they had actual involvement and whether they wanted actual involvement. The yes and no responses were summed to yield indices of decisional deprivation (actual involvement less than preferred), decisional equilibrium (actual involvement equal to preferred), and decisional saturation (actual involvement greater than preferred). Alutto and Belasco (1972) found that, overall, teachers tended to be decisionally deprived and that individuals experiencing high levels of deprivation possessed different characteristics than those reporting decisional equilibrium or saturation. No evidence was found that increased participation led to increased organizational commitment. Alutto and Belasco also cautioned about the consequences of increased participation when conditions of equilibrium and saturation

existed, noting that increasing influence under these conditions might prove dysfunctional.

Conway (1976) replaced the Alutto and Belasco scale with a Likert-type scale to measure degrees of decisional participation by educators. Conway's results supported the research of Alutto and Belasco (1972). Conway concluded that decisional deprivation was even more widespread than suggested by Alutto and Belasco. Conway also found that educators in a state of decisional equilibrium have greater job satisfaction than those in conditions of decisional deprivation or saturation (Conway, 1976).

Mohrman et al. (1978), following the work of Conway (1976), also utilized a Likert-type scale. They adopted the 12 decision areas of Alutto and Belasco (1972) as indices of decision making. The sample included 460 elementary and secondary regular classroom and special area educators in all 22 schools in an urban Midwest school district. While the primary purpose of this research was to investigate domains of decision making and to demonstrate that distinguishing between and among decisional domains had utility in terms of increasing the explanatory power of measures of participation, Mohrman et al. (1978) also found that teachers reported that they both have and should have more participation in technical areas than in managerial areas. What Mohrman et al. (1978) did not stress in the reporting of their results was that, while educators

reported actually having more involvement in technical areas and desiring more involvement in technical areas than in managerial areas, the difference in the factor means between ideal and actual participation was actually greater for the managerial factor (1.66) than the technical factor (.91). This implication was never discussed. Nothing was done with a weak third factor (negotiation) they uncovered since it contained only two items.

A few studies reported on in-place shared decision-making models. As part of their restructuring efforts, the Dade County Public Schools in Florida and Montgomery County Schools in Maryland had been involved in site-based management and shared decision-making initiatives. In both cases, new governance structures were in place, with decisions being made at the lowest possible levels (David, 1989).

One of the questions facing educators who are becoming involved in shared decision making and its various models is by what means will the participants be involved in the actual decision-making process. Traditional stereotypes about roles and zones of authority continue to frustrate attempts to move beyond principal-centered site-based management. Recent articles cautioned against equating site-based management or school-based management with shared decision making when the only meaning of site- or school-based management was more of the same--principals making

major decisions at the school site (Conley & Bacharach, 1990). According to Conley and Bacharach (1990), in order for school-site management to succeed, it must be approached with the goal of creating a professional work environment for all involved. School-site management by itself was no guarantee of administrative decentralization. Not much appeared to have changed Lortie's view (1969) that the teacher's primary sphere was the classroom and the principal's primarily the school-at-large.

While Alutto and Belasco in their 1972 study recommended that future research characterize the mode or mechanism of decision making, in order to move from a measure of rates of participation to qualitative descriptions of means of participation, two studies (Stuckwisch, 1986; Ferrara, 1992) were available for review in which decision making was characterized by mechanism of participation. Furthermore, Alutto and Belasco (1972) also recommended that "future research efforts might profitably focus on the relative impact of differing methods of participation in organization decision making, namely concentrating on type of participation in conjunction with overall rates of participation" (p. 124).

Stuckwisch (1986) reported that formal small groups were the most common means of involvement in decision making. Stuckwisch also reported that, for high schools, informal mechanisms such as private information and private

counsel were important components in decision-making schemes. Stuckwisch's study did not measure extent, and he measured only actual participation. Ferrara (1992) studied eight areas of decision making and measured actual and desired participation in shared decision making. The eight areas of decision making were planning, policy, curriculum/ instruction, pupil personnel, staff personnel, staff development, school/community, and budget/management.

> Looking at difference scores, we see that the area of greatest difference is cutting monies from budgets, with setting building-level goals showing a moderate difference and selecting instructional materials indicating the least difference. We contend that relative degree of difference is the most useful measure when choosing areas for sharing decisions and that investigating differences in the kinds of input is critical in determining how to expand teachers' involvement in decision making. (Ferrara & Repa, 1993, p. 71)

Summary

The study of shared decision making in the school setting is still in its infancy. Researchers have not yet accepted a universal definition of shared decision making. Few empirical studies on large samples exist. Few current studies exist. Additionally, researchers are still struggling with ways to conceptualize, measure, and describe the phenomenon. This study attempted to integrate some of the recommendations of the available empirical research on shared decision making and move the research forward.

Although still in its infancy, shared decision making has roots traceable to the 1930s. The study of shared

decision making has been grounded in theory rather than empirical research. It has been viewed as a cycle of events by which an organization makes and implements decisions, a conscious selection of choice among alternatives, requiring assignment of priorities to alternatives and acting on information.

A universal definition of shared decision making has not been accepted by researchers. A variety of studies have investigated the multidimensional nature of decisions within the school setting, attempting to provide classifications into domains of decision making. Recent research has underscored the need for rigorous methodology concerning the study of the patterns of decision making. Most recent researchers indicated that no original strong theory can be offered for shared decision making, in and of itself, and that shared decision making is less a theory and more a predication of a series of beliefs and/or assumptions. There is a need to understand processes by which shared decision making works and increased student learning occurs, as well as the situations which affect these processes. Problems arise when defining shared decision making because no consensus exists.

CHAPTER 3

Methodology and Procedures

Introduction

School leaders in Tennessee's public school districts are being challenged to implement the concept of shared decision making. The goal of shared decision making as the rule rather than the exception, as requested by the Tennessee State Board of Education (1990) in the Master Plan for Tennessee Schools: Preparing for the Twenty-First Century, will be met with varying stages of implementation.

An inquiry was conducted to discover if school leaders had definite opinions concerning what it would take for public schools in the First Educational District of Tennessee to have successful implementation of shared decision making. School leaders' base of knowledge and experiences indicated a wide range of skills and knowledge pertaining to shared decision making. Since those being investigated will probably be the implementators of shared decision making in the First Educational District of Tennessee, it was very worthwhile to learn their opinions prior to such implementation becoming fully funded in the state of Tennessee. Upon receipt of such information, further education could be a reference for the school leaders to gain empowerment necessary for shared decision

making and the necessary preparation for its successful implementation.

Methodology

The objective of this study was to gather information pertaining to the actual and desired implementation practices of school leaders concerning shared decision making in the First Educational District of Tennessee. The research questions listed in Chapter 1 were used as the basis for this investigation.

A descriptive research study was conducted. This method was selected because it provided the opportunity for adequate data collection and the analyses required for the study. Descriptive research is concerned with conditions or relationships that exist, opinions that are held, processes that are going on, effects that are evident, or trends that are developing (Best 1975).

Population

The population of this study included school leaders, school board chairpersons, central office personnel, and principals in the First Educational District of Tennessee, according to the 1993-94 Directory of Public Schools (Tennessee State Department of Education, 1994). The kindergarten-through-grade-12 educational program in the First District is comprised of 7 city systems and 10 county systems, which include 126 elementary schools, 28 middle

schools, and 33 high schools, administered by 187 separate school principals. There were 17 school board chairpersons and 82 identified central office personnel, for a population of 286 school leaders in the First Educational District of Tennessee.

The strategy of surveying the entire population was used to assure representativeness for the three categories of school leaders for the First Educational District of Tennessee. The data analyses and the resulting interpretation provided information that can be generalized to all elementary, middle, and secondary school principals, the school board chairpersons, and the central office personnel in the First Educational District of Tennessee.

Instrument Development

The review of literature and related research studies revealed a study concerning 10 organizational areas and shared decision making conducted by Donna Ferrara and Thomas Repa in New York State entitled "Measuring Shared Decision Making," found in the October, 1993, issue of Educational Leadership. After reviewing the results and requesting permission from Ferrara to use the instrument, the questionnaire developed by Ferrara, called Shared Education Decisions Survey, was selected as the instrument for this study to determine the success factors in shared decision making as viewed by school board chairpersons, central office personnel, and principals. Ferrara's instrument was

chosen because it has been adequately tested for validity and reliability.

The instrument utilized contained two parts: the Shared Education Decisions Survey and the supplementary independent variable (demographic) section.

Part one of the instrument, the Shared Education Decisions Survey (SEDS), collected data concerning the actual and desired perceptions in the 10 organizational areas that generally determine success factors in schools. A 6-point Likert scale was used on each of the 92 issues ranging from a 1 that indicated never, to a 2 that indicated rarely, to a 3 that indicated sometimes, to a 4 that indicated often, to a 5 that indicated usually, to a 6 that indicated always.

Ferrara and Repa organized the statements concerning 92 issues under 10 organizational areas: planning, policy, curriculum/instruction, pupil personnel, staff personnel, school/community relations, parentalal involvement, staff development, budget, and plant management.

Part two of the instrument was devoted to collecting supplementary independent variable data on the subjects: job position, sex, age, educational level attained and years of experience.

Instrument Validity and Reliability

Ferrara and Repa (1993) verified the content validity of the instrument based upon the pre-pilot, the pilot study,

and Ferrara's dissertation, Teacher Perceptions of Participation in Shared Decision Making in New York State (Ferrara, 1992). According to Ferrara, all respondents stated that the directions were clear and that each issue was answerable for all participants involved in the study.

Ferrara and Repa determined reliability using Cronbach's Alpha for each of the 10 organizational areas. Table 1 reports the reliability for each organizational area of the Shared Education Decisions Survey (SEDS).

Data Collection Procedures

The names and office addresses of all school board chairpersons, central office personnel, and principals in the First Educational District of Tennessee were obtained from the office of Dr. Ted Beach, Director of the First Educational District, State Department of Education.

The survey instrument and a stamped, self-addressed envelope were mailed to all school leaders in the First Educational District of Tennessee. All were asked to respond to the survey and promptly return it by using the envelope provided. A 2-week time frame was planned as a guide to encourage a speedy return.

A tracking code was generated for each participant by using the system and school number designated by the Tennessee State Department of Education. This number was written on a record-keeping form and the survey response

Table 1

Reliability Results on the Shared Education Decisions Survey

Category	Cronbach Alpha reliabilities (SEDS) 1993		
	# Items/ category	Actual scores	Desired scores
Planning	12	.95	.94
Policy	11	.91	.94
Curriculum/instruction	10	.96	.97
Pupil personnel	7	.85	.92
Staff personnel	14	.93	.96
School/community	7	.86	.92
Parental involvement	5	.90	.91
Staff development	5	.95	.97
Budget	12	.94	.95
Plant management	9	.86	.91

form in an attempt to track the nonreturn of responses from participants.

As surveys were returned, names were checked off the record-keeping form. When participants failed to return the survey, a second copy was mailed, asking for their help in the completion of this study. The second survey was coded the same way.

Data Analysis

The data collected from the surveys were analyzed, using the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences--Personal Computer (Norusis, 1990), to provide a summary description of the opinions of school leaders in the First Educational District of Tennessee concerning shared decision making. The frequencies, means, and percentages were used to indicate the average score and the variability of scores among the groups of elementary, middle, and secondary school leaders, the school chairpersons, and the central office personnel. A series of *t*-tests was used to analyze data for the first three hypotheses; analysis of variance was used for the last three hypotheses.

Inferential statistics were used to make inferences for the population based on the returns. Since the whole population was mailed a survey, the returns were classified as the sample of school leaders in the First Educational District of Tennessee. The null hypotheses were tested at the .05 level of significance. The instrument was divided into 10 organizational areas: planning, policy, curriculum/instruction, pupil personnel, staff personnel, school/community, parentalal involvement, staff development, budget, and plant management. Analysis of actual and desired responses among the positions and the 10 areas of decision making determined the significance of the

hypotheses. All school board chairpersons, central office personnel, and principals were compared to each other.

A further division was completed to compare the actual and desired participation in relation to the respondents' gender, age, job description, experience, and education. The comparisons were made using the Kruskal-Wallis test of analysis of variance, with the exception of gender, which used the two-variable Mann-Whitney test. All Kruskal-Wallis tests that displayed significance to the .05 level were further tested via the Mann-Whitney test to identify points of significance.

Tables were used to present the tabulation of data from the questionnaires, to answer the research questions, and to test the null hypotheses of the study. The following hypotheses stated in the null were tested for significance at the .05 level.

Hypothesis 1

There will be no significant difference between the desired and the actual participation among school board chairpersons in shared decision making in the following 10 categories: planning, policy, curriculum/instruction, pupil personnel, staff personnel, school/community, parental involvement, staff development, budget, and plant management in the First Educational District of Tennessee.

Hypothesis 2

There will be no significant difference between the desired and the actual participation among central office personnel in shared decision making in the following 10 categories: planning, policy, curriculum/instruction, pupil personnel, staff personnel, school/community, parental involvement, staff development, budget, and plant management in the First Educational District of Tennessee.

Hypothesis 3

There will be no significant difference between the desired and the actual participation among principals in shared decision making in the following 10 categories: planning, policy, curriculum/instruction, pupil personnel, staff personnel, school/community, parental involvement, staff development, budget, and plant management in the First Educational District of Tennessee.

Hypothesis 4

There will be no significant differences between school board chairpersons, central office personnel, and principals concerning the actual implementation of shared decision making in the First Educational District of Tennessee.

Hypothesis 5

There will be no significant differences between school board chairpersons, central office personnel, and principals

concerning the desired implementation of shared decision making in the First Educational District of Tennessee.

Hypothesis 6

There will be no significant differences between job description, age, sex, educational level, and experience of school leaders and their perception of implementation factors in shared decision making in the First Educational District of Tennessee.

CHAPTER 4

Presentation of Data and Analysis of Findings

Overview

This study investigated the actual and desired attributes of shared decision making as viewed by educational leaders in the First Educational District of Tennessee. The study had two purposes. One purpose was to determine what level of actual participation concerning shared decision making was being implemented by principals, central office personnel, and school board chairpersons. A second purpose was to determine the desired level of participation concerning shared decision making by the same personnel. The study was conducted by surveying the entire population of identified school leaders in the First Eductional District of Tennessee. The entire population consisted of 286 school leaders. The returns made up a sample of 222, for a 78% response rate. The population included 187 principals, 82 central office personnel, and 17 school board chairpersons. Principals made up the largest amount of returns, consisting of 148 of 187 for a response rate of 79%. The central office personnel had the highest rate of return, 66 of 82 for a rate of 80%. The school board chairpersons returned the surveys at a rate of 47%, consisting of 8 respondents of 17 chairpersons mailed surveys.

Chapter 4 is composed of the demographic characteristics of respondents, statistical analyses used in the study, and selected comments. The analyses included are presented in both narrative and tabular form.

A frequencies procedure was used to determine the mean and standard deviation of responses to survey statements among the three groups of school leaders. Frequencies were used to determine significance among the actual and desired categories for each of the three surveyed groups. Nonparametric Wilcoxon tests were used to test the significance of the actual and desired attributes of each category, one variable against the other. For more statistical evidence, the nonparametric Kruskal-Wallis test of several variables was used to determine significance in relation to actual and desired attributes by demographic data. When significance was determined, a nonparametric Wilcoxon test was administered to determine exactly which variable or variables were the cause of the significance.

The demographics for this study were defined as job position, gender, age, years of experience in education, and educational level attained. The data were obtained in January and February, 1994. The survey instrument was anonymous. The State Department of Education's 1993-94 Directory of Public Schools was used to obtain address information for mailing of the survey instrument.

Population and Sample

The population for this study contained a total of 286 possible participants. According to the 1993-94 Directory of Public Schools (Tennessee State Department of Education, 1994), 286 is the total population of principals, identified system-wide central office personnel, and school board chairpersons in the 17 school systems served in the First Educational District of Tennessee.

The population consisted of 187 principals, 82 identified system-wide central office personnel, and 17 school board chairpersons.

The entire population was surveyed and the respondents represent the sample. The respondents numbered 222 and the entire populations numbered 286. Specific job descriptions of respondents included 98 elementary principals, 27 middle school principals, 24 secondary principals, 11 superintendents, 10 assistant superintendents, 8 supervisors of special education, 5 Chapter One supervisors, 8 school board chairpersons, and 31 other central office personnel holding a system-wide position. The number of individuals in the population and the number responding to the survey are presented in Table 2.

Table 2

Population and Sample Returns by Position

Position	Population	Sample	Response rate (%)
Principals	187	148	79
Elementary	126	98	78
Middle School	28	26	93
High School	33	24	73
Central Office	82	66	80
Superintendent	17	11	65
Assistant Superintendent	11	10	91
Supervisors	54	45	83
School Board Chairpersons	17	8	47
Total	286	222	78

Demographic Profile of Respondents

Selected demographic characteristics (gender, age, educational level, and experience) were collected from the respondents. A brief discussion of these characteristics follows and the complete data are presented in Table 3.

Table 3

A Demographic Profile of Those Responding to the Survey Including Respondents' Gender, Age, Educational Background, and Years of Experience

Characteristic	Prin n	Prin %	Cent Off n	Cent Off %	SchBdCh n	SchBdCh %	Total n	Total %
Gender								
Female	30	20.3	24	36.4	3	37.5	57	25.7
Male	118	79.7	42	63.6	5	62.5	165	74.3
Total	148	100.0	66	100.0	8	100.0	222	100.0
Age								
20-29	1	0.7	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	0.4
30-39	16	10.8	0	0.0	0	0.0	16	7.2
40-49	68	45.9	34	51.5	5	62.5	107	48.2
50-59	36	24.3	24	36.4	1	12.5	61	27.5
60-69	9	6.1	5	7.6	0	0.0	14	6.3
70 and over	0	0.0	2	3.0	2	25.0	4	1.8
Missing	18	12.2	1	1.5	0	0.0	19	8.6
Total	148	100.0	66	100.0	8	100.0	222	100.0
Educational level								
BS	2	1.3	0	0.0	2	25.0	4	1.8
MA	53	35.8	16	24.2	1	12.5	70	31.5
MA+45	62	41.9	26	39.4	0	0.0	88	39.6
Ed.S	21	14.2	4	6.1	0	0.0	25	11.3
Ed.D	9	6.1	19	28.8	0	0.0	28	12.6
Other	1	0.7	1	1.5	4	50.0	6	2.7
Missing	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	12.5	1	0.5
Total	148	100.0	66	100.0	8	100.0	222	100.0

Table 3 (continued)

Characteristic	Prin n	Prin %	Cent Off n	Cent Off %	SchBdCh n	SchBdCh %	Total n	Total %
Experience in years								
Less than 5	4	2.7	0	0.0	3	37.5	7	3.2
6-10	3	2.0	1	1.5	1	12.5	5	2.3
11-15	17	11.5	3	4.6	0	0.0	20	9.0
16-20	32	21.6	8	12.1	2	25.0	42	18.9
21-25	40	27.0	19	28.8	0	0.0	59	26.6
26-30	31	20.9	17	25.8	0	0.0	48	21.6
31-40	14	9.5	16	24.2	1	12.5	31	13.9
Over 40	5	3.4	2	3.0	0	0.0	7	3.2
Missing	2	1.4	0	0.0	1	12.5	3	1.3
Total	148	100.0	66	100.0	8	100.0	222	100.0

Note. Prin = Principals; Cent Off = Central Office Personnel; SchBdCh = School Board Chairpersons.

Gender

One hundred sixty-five males and 57 females responded to the survey. Males hold 80% of the principalships, 64% of the central office positions, and 63% school board chairpersons' positions.

Age

The largest percentage (52%) of principals responding was in the 40-49 years of age category. Likewise, this age range was the most often identified for the central office

personnel (52%) and the school board chairpersons (63%). Overall, 48% of the respondents were in the 40-49 age range.

Educational Level

The Master's degree plus 45 was the most frequent educational level for the principals (42%) and the central office personnel (39%). The "Other" educational level was the most often selected for school board chairpersons (57%). Central office personnel held the most Doctorates, but most of the personnel with Educational Specialist degrees were held by principals.

Sixty-two percent of the principals had at least a Master's degree plus 45 hours. Of central office personnel, 75.8% of the respondents had at least a Master's degree plus 45 hours in education.

Years of Professional Educational Experience

Respondents were also asked how many years of experience they had attained. The largest group of both the principals and central office personnel (29%) had spent from 21-25 years in their positions. As might be expected, half of the school board chairpersons had less than 10 years of experience as school board members--43% less than 5.

Sixty-two percent of the principals and 82% of the central office personnel had at least 20 years of experience.

Reliability

Cronbach's Alpha was the test used to determine the reliability of the Shared Decision Making Survey as returned from the school leaders in the First Educational District of Tennessee. The reliabilities found in the Ferrara study (Ferrara & Repa, 1993) are comparable to those found in this study (see Tables 1 and 4) although most of the reliabilities generated in this study were slightly lower than those previously reported. The range of .86 for school/community and plant management to .95 in planning in the actual scores and from .92 in pupil personnel to .97 for curriculum/instruction and staff development in the desired scores is comparable to this study's .82 in planning to .91 in curriculum/instruction for actual scores and .85 in budget to .92 in staff development in the desired scores. The instrument appeared to have adequate reliability levels for each subscale.

Analysis of Findings

Data analyses that correspond to the research questions found in Chapter 1 and hypotheses in Chapter 3 were accomplished through descriptive and inferential statistical procedures. Principals, system-wide central office personnel, and school board chairpersons were asked to respond by means of a Likert-type 6-point scale on a continuum (1 "never," 2 "rarely," 3 "sometimes," 4 "often," 5 "usually," and 6 "always") to 92 statements containing 10

Table 4

Shared Education Decision Survey (SEDS), Cronbach Alpha Reliability Coefficients for the First Educational District of Tennessee for the 1993-94 School Year

Category	# Items/ category	Actual scores	Desired scores
Planning	12	.82	.86
Policy	11	.87	.89
Curriculum/instruction	10	.91	.91
Pupil personnel	7	.86	.90
Staff personnel	14	.84	.87
School/community	7	.89	.90
Parental involvement	5	.89	.91
Staff development	5	.93	.92
Budget	12	.84	.85
Plant management	9	.90	.90

organizational areas of shared educational decisions. The respondents were asked to respond in the area of actual and the area of desired participation in shared decision making.

Three nonparametric statistical tests were used to analyze the differences between the educational leaders and their actual and desired attributes concerning shared decision making. Nonparametric tests can be used when the parametric assumptions of normality and homogeneity of variance are not met (Hinkle, Wiersma, & Jurs, 1988). Based

on the information being collected, these tests were found to be the most appropriate for this study.

Initially, the Wilcoxon Matched-pairs Signed-ranks Test was used to determine the overall differences between actual and desired responses within the 20 areas of decision making included in the survey. The Wilcoxon test measured, by position, the 10 organizational areas of decision making, comparing actual participation and desired participation.

The Kruskal-Wallis one-way analysis of variance was used to determine if any significance existed between the 3 surveyed groups and the 20 (10 actual and 10 desired) different organizational areas within the survey. If such significance occurred, the group was further analyzed using a Mann-Whitney two-variable test to determine which groups differed significantly. The Kruskal-Wallis was also used to determine if any demographic data had significant differences and, if so, the Mann-Whitney test was administered to determine which groups differed.

Research questions and hypotheses 1 through 6 were essentially the same and were interpreted using descriptive statistics to classify and summarize the numerical data in narrative and table form.

The interpretation of the data for the first three hypotheses made use of the subscale grand mean information which was the average responses based on the Likert scale of 6 points, ranging from 1 to 6, with 1 meaning "never" and 6

meaning "always." The last three hypotheses were tested by the Kruskal-Wallis analysis of variance test to find areas of significant differences, then the Mann-Whitney U test was administered to test one variable against another to find the area displaying the significance. The procedure held true for all areas except gender, where the Mann-Whitney U was administered without the Kruskal-Wallis since for the purposes of this study two possibilities of gender were all that were surveyed.

The respondents reported the feelings of actual participation and their desired participation in the 10 areas of organizational decision making. The planning area (12 questions) dealt with change, philosophy, goals, improvements, and change initiatives. The policy category (11 questions) was concerned with guidelines, conduct, retention, testing, extracurricular activities, and evaluation. The curriculum and instruction area (10 questions) was about curriculum development, textbooks, instructional materials, teaching methods, and evaluation of programs. The pupil personnel category (7 questions) was concerned with student placement, class size, reporting methods to parents, student personal problems, and the general administration of guidance/support services and rewards. The staff personnel category (14 questions) dealt with hiring, selecting, orientating, and assigning

personnel, planning agendas, and resolving employee grievances. The school/community relations category (7 questions) was about involving the community, businesses, determining content of news released to media, and resolving difficulties with outside groups.

The parental involvement category (5 questions) was concerned with parental involvement in the schools, selection of events, and resolving parental complaints. The staff development category (5 questions) was concerned with committee assignments, needs assessments, designing staff development activities, implementing the activities, and evaluating the activities.

The budget category (12 questions) dealt with formulating, allocating, and managing the budget at the district and building levels. The plant management category (9 questions) was concerned with determining the use of school projects, priorities for planning, use, maintenance, bus schedules, routes, and hours of school schedule.

Respondents' General Direction for Survey

The 222 respondents to the Shared Educational Decisions Survey displayed interest in the 10 organizational decision areas. By having an average response rate in the "sometimes" choice area for their overall actual participation, the respondents displayed a rather pessimistic view of their actual participation. By having an average response rate in the "often" choice area for

their desired participation, they displayed a rather limited desire for participation. If the "often" choice is the optimistic desired amount of participation, educators in the First Educational District of Tennessee may need to reevaluate shared decision making in the organizational decision-making areas surveyed in this study (see Tables 5-7).

The school board chairpersons responded to actual participation in the "sometimes" choice area; but, unfortunately, their desired amount of participation was not quite to the "often" choice area response. School board chairpersons felt they had very little actual participation in the areas of staff development and parental involvement, but they did not seem to want much participation in these areas. Conversely, school board chairpersons felt they had participation in the planning and plant management areas and desired even more participation in these areas (see Table 5).

The central office personnel felt they actually had less participation opportunities than school board chairpersons and they desired less participation overall in the 10 organizational decision-making areas. A notable exception was in the area of staff development. The central office personnel had an "often" response average in staff development and desired even more participation opportunities. The areas of parental involvement and plant

management had a relatively small amount of actual participation and little desire was indicated for opportunities in these organizational decision-making areas (see Table 6).

The principals responding displayed the most optimistic view of shared decision making of the three positions responding to the survey. Principals' average response choice was an "often" in the actual participation and "usually" in the desired overall participation rate. Principals significantly felt they had more participation in parental involvement and staff development and they desired more participation opportunities in these areas. Plant management was an area of decision making in which principals felt they had a relatively small amount of participation with more desired opportunities requested by principals (see Table 7).

Respondents to the survey desired more participation than they felt they actually had at the present time. The desired participation, however, was an overall "often" response choice, which was not very optimistic for proponents of shared educational decision making.

Hypothesis 1

There will be no significant difference between the desired and the actual participation of school board chairpersons in shared decision making, in the following 10 categories: planning, policy, curriculum/instruction, pupil

personnel, staff personnel, school/community, parental involvement, staff development, budget, and plant management in the First Educational District of Tennessee.

Eight school board chairpersons' responses were analyzed to determine if there was a significant difference in the desired and the actual participation in the 10 organizational decision-making areas (see Table 5).

The null hypothesis was rejected for the areas of policy, staff personnel, and school/community. There was a significant difference in the organizational decision-making areas of policy ($z = -1.99$), staff personnel ($z = -2.02$) and school/community ($z = -2.02$). In each case, more participation was desired than was perceived to be actually present.

For the other seven areas, the null hypothesis was retained. Although more participation was desired, the differences were not statistically significant.

Hypothesis 2

There will be no significant difference between the desired and the actual participation among central office personnel in shared decision making in the following 10 categories: planning, policy, curriculum/instruction, pupil personnel, staff personnel, school/community, parent involvement, staff development, budget, and plant management in the First Educational District of Tennessee.

Table 5

Wilcoxon Matched-pairs Signed-ranks Test Results of School Board Chairpersons and Their Responses of Actual and Desired Participation Concerning 10 Organizational Areas of Shared Educational Decisions

Organizational area	Subscale grand mean (actual)	Actual mean	Desired mean	Subscale grand mean (desired)	z
Planning	4.03	48.43	54.13	4.51	-1.83NS
Policy	3.75	41.29	49.00	4.45	-1.99*
Curriculum/ instruction	3.19	31.88	40.13	4.01	-1.90NS
Pupil personnel	2.52	17.63	19.26	2.75	-0.84NS
Staff personnel	3.09	43.29	52.33	3.76	-2.02*
School/community	3.63	25.38	28.86	4.12	-2.02*
Parental involvement	2.78	13.88	15.25	3.05	-1.07NS
Staff development	2.65	13.25	14.63	2.93	-1.60NS
Budget	3.82	45.86	47.70	3.98	-1.60NS
Plant management	4.43	39.88	42.00	4.67	-1.62NS

*Significant at the .05 level, two-tailed test.

NS = Not significant.

Responses from 66 central office personnel were analyzed to determine if there was a significant difference in the desired and the actual participation in the 10 organizational decision-making areas.

The null hypothesis was rejected for each of the 10 organizational areas (see Table 6). In every case, central office personnel desired more participation than they believed actually occurred. Central office personnel significantly desired more participation in shared educational decision making in the 10 organizational decision-making areas than they felt they had at the time.

Table 6

Wilcoxon Matched-pairs Signed-ranks Test Results of Central Office Personnel and Their Responses of Actual and Desired Participation Concerning 10 Organizational Areas of Shared Educational Decisions

Organizational area	Subscale grand mean (actual)	Actual mean	Desired mean	Subscale grand mean (desired)	z
Planning	3.89	46.68	53.24	4.44	-5.56***
Policy	3.53	38.88	45.21	4.11	-5.25***
Curriculum/ instruction	3.61	36.14	40.84	4.08	-4.94***
Pupil personnel	3.04	21.33	24.12	3.45	-4.26***
Staff personnel	3.32	46.49	55.05	3.93	-5.12***
School/community	3.32	23.21	25.75	3.68	-3.95***
Parental involvement	2.92	14.58	15.95	3.19	-2.83**
Staff development	4.08	20.39	21.20	4.24	-2.08*
Budget	3.13	37.57	40.77	3.40	-3.22**
Plant management	2.72	24.45	28.71	3.19	-4.56***

*Significant at the .05 level, two-tailed test.
**Significant at the .01 level, two-tailed test.
***Significant at the .001 level, two-tailed test.
NS = Not significant.

Hypothesis 3

There will be no significant difference between the desired and the actual participation among principals in shared decision making in the following 10 categories: planning, policy, curriculum/instruction, pupil personnel, staff personnel, school/community, parent involvement, staff development, budget, and plant management in the First Educational District of Tennessee.

Responses from 148 principals were analyzed to determine if there was a significant difference in the desired and the actual participation in the 10 organizational decision-making areas (see Table 7).

The null hypothesis was rejected for each of the 10 organizational decison-making areas. There was a significant difference in each organizational decision-making area.

Principals significantly desired more participation in shared educational decision-making in the 10 organizational decision-making areas than they felt they had at the time.

Table 7

Wilcoxon Matched-pairs Signed-ranks Test Results of Principals and Their Responses of Actual and Desired Participation Concerning 10 Organizational Areas of Shared Educational Decisions

Organizational area	Subscale grand mean (actual)	Actual mean	Desired mean	Subscale grand mean (desired)	z
Planning	4.13	49.55	59.20	4.93	-9.20***
Policy	3.62	39.78	53.24	4.85	-9.43***
Curriculum/ instruction	3.68	36.78	45.40	4.54	-8.51***
Pupil personnel	4.11	28.80	32.94	4.71	-7.99***
Staff personnel	3.98	55.68	65.96	4.71	-8.63***
School/community	4.25	29.72	33.26	4.75	-7.95***
Parental involvement	4.53	22.67	24.30	4.86	-4.64***
Staff development	4.38	21.92	24.10	4.82	-6.37***
Budget	3.56	42.75	52.40	4.37	-7.96***
Plant management	3.20	28.84	38.88	4.32	-8.93***

***Significant at the .001 level, two-tailed test.

NS = Not significant.

Hypothesis 4

There will be no significant differences between school board chairpersons, central office personnel, and principals related to their actual responses concerning participation

in shared decision making in the First Educational District of Tennessee.

The Kruskal-Wallis one-way analysis of variance was administered to test the hypothesis. For the area of actual planning, actual policy, and actual curriculum, the null hypothesis was retained; but in the 7 other organizational areas the null hypothesis was rejected. A significant difference was found among the three groups--principals, central office personnel, and school board chairpersons--on the areas of actual pupil personnel, actual staff personnel, actual school/community, actual parental involvement, actual staff development, actual budget, and actual plant management. The data are presented in Table 8.

A Mann-Whitney U Test was administered to find which group or groups were significantly different since the Mann-Whitney U two-variable nonparametric test does not make assumptions on homogeneity or equality. These data are presented in Table 9. The Mann-Whitney indicated that principals perceived they had significantly more actual participation than the central office personnel in categories of pupil personnel, staff personnel, school/community, parental involvement, budget, and plant management. The principals perceived they had significantly more actual participation than school board chairpersons in the areas of pupil personnel, staff personnel, staff development and plant management. The central office

personnel perceived themselves to have significantly more actual participation in staff development than the school board chairpersons, and the school board chairpersons perceived they had significantly more actual participation in plant management than the central office personnel.

The general direction of the data indicated principals had significantly more participation in shared educational decisions in the surveyed organizational decision-making areas than central office personnel in all 10 areas and school board chairpersons with the exception of plant management. The central office personnel had more actual participation in staff development than school board chairpersons. The school board chairpersons had more actual participation in actual plant management than central office personnel.

Table 8

Kruskal-Wallis One-Way Analysis of Variance of Ordinal Data and the Levels of Significance of Actual Participation Responses in Relation to 10 Organizational Areas of Shared Educational Decisions by Principals, Central Office Personnel, and School Board Chairpersons Surveyed

Category	X^2	Significance
Actual planning	3.09	.21NS
Actual policy	0.68	.71NS
Actual curriculum/instruction	0.73	.69NS
Actual pupil personnel	56.14	.00***
Actual staff personnel	18.99	.00***
Actual school/community	25.28	.00***
Actual parental involvement	73.81	.00***
Actual staff development	9.65	.01**
Actual budget	7.40	.02*
Actual plant management	19.21	.00***

*Significant at the .05 level, two-tailed test.
**Significant at the .01 level, two tailed test.
***Significant at the .001 level, two-tailed test.
NS = Not significant.

Table 9

Mann-Whitney U Test Results of Significance by Position Surveyed in Organizational Areas Found to be Significant

Category	Mean Rank: Prin	Mean Rank: Cent Off	U	z
Actual pupil personnel	124.59	62.55	1917.0	-6.90***
Actual staff personnel	103.78	68.80	2268.5	-4.10***
Actual school/ community	115.26	71.13	2465.5	-4.97***
Actual parental involvement	127.01	53.64	1329.0	-8.26***
Actual budget	106.82	84.57	3268.0	-2.51*
Actual plant management	111.85	82.04	3170.5	-3.35***

Category	Mean Rank: Prin	Mean Rank: SchBdCh	U	z
Actual pupil personnel	79.39	15.44	87.5	-4.03***
Actual staff personnel	69.89	33.50	206.5	-2.40*
Actual parental involvement	77.64	19.63	121.0	-3.73***
Actual staff development	78.63	28.94	195.5	-3.14***
Actual plant management	72.03	117.69	214.5	-2.93***

Table 9 (continued)

Category	Mean Rank: Cent Off	Mean Rank: SchBdCh	U	z
Actual staff development	38.80	18.06	108.5	-2.65**
Actual plant management	33.73	58.63	79.0	-3.17**

Note. Prin = Principals; Cent Off = Central Office Personnel; SchBdCh = School Board Chairpersons.

*Significant at the .05 level, two-tailed test.
**Significant at the .01 level, two-tailed test.
***Significant at the .001 level, two-tailed test.
NS = Not significant.

Hypothesis 5

There will be no significant differences between school board chairpersons, central office personnel, and principals related to their desired responses concerning participation in shared decision making in the First Educational District of Tennessee.

The Kruskal-Wallis one-way analysis of variance was administered to test the hypothesis, and in all 10 areas there was a rejection of the null hypothesis. Respondents in these three positions differed significantly in the amount of desired participation (see Table 10).

The Mann-Whitney test was used to determine where the significant differences were to be found. In all 10

organizational decision-making areas, principals desired more participation than central office personnel. When the principals were compared to the school board chairpersons, the desired areas of pupil personnel, staff personnel, parental involvement, and staff development were significant. When the central office personnel were compared to the school board chairpersons, the area of desired staff development was significant for the central office personnel; but, in the area of desired plant management, the school board chairperson was significantly different from the central office personnel. The direction for all positions was a desire for more participation in the organizational areas. These data are presented in Table 11. (See Appendix C to find the overall mean for each category by position and entire population in the desired area.)

Table 10

Kruskal-Wallis One-Way Analysis of Variance of Ordinal Data and the Levels of Significance of Desired Participation Responses in Relation to 10 Organizational Areas of Shared Educational Decisions by Positions Surveyed

Category	X^2	Level of significance
Desired planning	14.84	.00***
Desired policy	19.70	.00***
Desired curriculum/instruction	8.55	.01*
Desired pupil personnel	68.69	.00***
Desired staff personnel	26.07	.00***
Desired school/community	38.27	.00***
Desired parental involvement	68.88	.00***
Desired staff development	19.52	.00***
Desired budget	29.78	.00***
Desired plant management	35.09	.00***

*Significant at the .05 level, two-tailed test.
***Significant at the .001 level, two-tailed test.
NS = Not significant.

Table 11

Mann-Whitney U Test Results of Significance by Group Surveyed in Categories Found to be Significant

Category	Mean Rank: Prin	Mean Rank: Cent Off	U	z
Desired planning	108.96	75.89	2752.0	-3.80***
Desired policy	110.05	72.75	2567.0	-4.32***
Desired curriculum/ instruction	108.18	83.40	3217.5	-2.80**
Desired pupil personnel	125.01	56.83	1549.0	-7.64***
Desired staff personnel	100.70	61.01	1820.5	-4.84***
Desired school/ community	115.48	62.65	1931.0	-6.09***
Desired parental involvement	122.49	52.56	1284.0	-8.02***
Desired staff development	111.84	82.06	3172.0	-3.36***
Desired budget	110.13	62.77	1925.0	-5.42***
Desired plant management	116.29	65.35	2099.0	-5.76***

Category	Mean Rank: Prin	Mean Rank: SchBdCh	U	z
Desired pupil personnel	78.72	9.38	39.0	-4.43***
Desired staff personnel	64.91	25.17	130.0	-2.62**

Table 11 (continued)

Category	Mean Rank Prin	Mean Rank SchBdCh	U	z
Desired parental involvement	74.96	22.13	141.0	-3.52***
Desired staff development	77.46	22.63	145.0	-3.54***

Category	Mean Rank Cent Off	Mean Rank SchBdCh	U	z
Desired staff development	38.77	18.38	111.0	-2.61**
Desired plant management	33.02	54.69	94.5	-2.84**

Note. Prin = Principals; Cent Off = Central Office Personnel; SchBdCh = School Board Chairpersons.

**Significant at the .01 level, two-tailed test.
***Significant at the .001 level, two-tailed test.
NS = Not significant.

Hypothesis 6

There will be no significant differences between the actual and desired participation in shared decision making among school leaders in the First Educational District of Tennessee by the following demographic subgroups: gender, age, educational level, and experience.

The sixth null hypothesis stated there would be no significant difference between the actual and desired participation of school leaders in shared decision making in the First Educational District of Tennessee by the following demographic subgroups: gender, age, educational level, and experience. Separate tests were conducted for each characteristic.

Two hundred twenty-two respondents' responses were analyzed in the overall analysis of gender using the Mann-Whitney U test to determine if there was a significant difference in the females' responses compared to the males' responses when considering actual and desired participation in the 10 organizational decision-making areas. The null hypothesis was rejected in the area of budget decisions.

There was a significant difference in the organizational decision-making area of budget decisions ($z = -2.27$) with the mean rank for males being significantly higher than the females' mean rank (see Table 12). The null hypothesis was retained for the other nine areas.

The Mann-Whitney U test was used to test for differences in the actual and desired levels of participation by gender. The Kruskal-Wallis one-way analysis of variance was used to test for differences in the actual and desired levels of participation by age, educational level, and experience. When a significant overall Kruskal-Wallis test was significant, pair-wise,

Mann-Whitney U tests were conducted to determine where the specific group differences were found. While cited in the text, the table showing these pair-wise comparisons are presented in Appendix D. The Mann-Whitney U tests for differences between females and males are presented in Table 12.

Table 12

Mann-Whitney U Tests of Differences in Actual and Desired Levels of Participation by Gender

Organizational area	M rank		
	Females	Males	z
Actual planning	94.50	110.81	-1.71NS
Desired planning	101.77	102.75	-0.10NS
Actual policy	95.66	112.24	-1.71NS
Desired policy	97.74	102.70	-0.52NS
Actual curriculum/ instruction	113.34	104.79	-0.89NS
Desired curriculum/ instruction	114.94	100.75	-1.50NS
Actual pupil personnel	98.62	112.70	-1.45NS
Desired pupil personnel	106.03	108.02	-0.21NS
Actual staff personnel	83.36	100.76	-1.87NS
Desired staff personnel	82.73	93.27	-1.11NS

Table 12 (continued)

Organizational area	M rank		
	Females	Males	z
Actual school/ community	96.68	108.55	-1.24NS
Desired school/ community	96.21	103.89	-0.80NS
Actual parental involvement	96.41	111.34	-1.54NS
Desired parental involvement	95.62	106.74	-1.15NS
Actual staff development	117.15	104.85	-1.27NS
Desired staff development	115.72	103.43	-1.27NS
Actual budget	99.49	104.85	-0.56NS
Desired budget	83.58	104.88	-2.27*
Actual plant management	99.42	108.92	-0.98NS
Desired plant management	95.00	107.75	-1.33NS

*Significant at the .05 level, two-tailed test.
NS = Not significant.

The gender demographic was further analyzed with data representing the three positions: principals, central office personnel, and school board chairpersons.

One hundred forty-eight principals responded to the survey and had the following areas with significant

differences: desired planning, desired curriculum and instruction, desired pupil personnel, actual school and community involvement, desired school and community involvement, actual parental involvement, actual staff development, and desired staff development (see Table 13). For areas of the survey on which principals did not meet the stipulation of a significant difference at the .05 level or below, see Appendix E.

Sixty-six central office personnel responded to the survey with the following areas with significant differences: actual planning, desired planning, actual school and community, desired school and community, actual parental involvement, actual plant management, and desired plant management. For areas of the survey on which central office personnel did not meet the stipulation of a significant difference at the .05 level or below, see Appendix E.

Eight school board chairpersons responded to the survey without any areas displaying significant differences in the gender demographic. For results see Appendix E.

Table 13

Mann-Whitney U Test Results Of Organizational Areas with Significant Differences by Gender

Organizational area	Gender	Mean rank	Mean	Cases	z
		Principals			
Desired planning	M	64.20	58.52	108	
	F	81.21	62.04	26	-2.01*
Desired curriculum/instruction	M	65.42	44.51	109	
	F	84.84	48.72	29	-2.33*
Desired pupil personnel	M	67.54	32.49	112	
	F	84.34	34.69	29	-1.98*
Actual school/community	M	66.00	29.05	111	
	F	85.86	32.36	28	-2.33*
Desired school/community	M	62.64	32.63	107	
	F	84.96	35.88	26	-2.66*
Actual parental involvement	M	67.04	22.22	112	

	F	84.34	24.46	28	-2.03*

Table 13 (continued)

Organizational area	Gender	Mean rank	Mean	Cases	z
Actual staff development	M	67.69	21.34	114	
	F	88.95	24.21	29	-2.48*
Desired staff development	M	66.64	23.66	113	
	F	86.65	25.89	27	-2.32*
	Central Office Personnel				
Actual planning	M	37.10	49.92	39	
	F	23.71	41.42	24	-2.82*
Desired planning	M	35.04	54.74	39	
	F	25.50	50.70	23	-2.01*
Actual school/community	M	37.09	25.45	40	
	F	23.15	19.30	23	-2.91*

Desired school/community	M	36.77	27.51	41	
	F	23.11	22.45	22	-2.82*

Table 13 (continued)

Organizational area	Gender	Mean rank	Mean	Cases	z
Actual parental involvement	M	37.96	15.86	42	
	F	25.69	12.33	24	-2.51*
Actual plant management	M	37.35	27.83	41	
	F	23.85	18.43	23	-2.79*
Desired plant management	M	35.47	31.63	40	
	F	24.27	23.41	22	-2.34*

*Significant at the .05 level, 2-tailed test.

Two hundred twenty-two respondents' responses were analyzed in the overall analysis of age using the Kruskal-Wallis analysis of variance test to determine if there was a significant difference in the age categories responses when considering actual and desired participation in the 10 organizational decision-making areas.

Significant differences were found in the organizational decision-making areas of desired pupil personnel decisions, actual budget decisions, and actual plant planning decisions (see Table 14). (The areas without a significant difference, overall and by position, are in Appendix F.)

Further analysis by position was administered using the Kruskal-Wallis analysis of variance test for the age of the respondents to determine if there was a significant difference in the age categories responses when considering actual and desired participation in the 10 organizational decision-making areas of planning, policy, curriculum/ instruction, pupil personnel, staff personnel, school/ community, parental involvement, staff development, budget, and plant management.

One hundred forty-eight principals responded to the survey and had the following areas with significant difference: desired policy making, actual pupil personnel decisions, and actual staff development decisions (see Table 14). The areas of significant difference for principals

were further analyzed using the Mann-Whitney U two-variable test of analysis to determine which age category had the significant difference (see Table 15).

There was a significant difference for principals in the organizational decision-making of desired policy decisions with the 30-39 age range having a higher mean rank when compared to the 40-49 age range. There was also a significant difference for principals in the organizational decision-making area of desired policy decisions with the 50-59 age range having a higher mean rank than the 40-49 age range. There was a significant difference for principals in the organizational decision-making area of desired policy decisions with the 60-69 age range having a higher mean rank than the 40-49 age range.

A significant difference was found for principals in the organizational decision-making area of actual pupil personnel decisions with the 50-59 age range having a higher mean rank when compared to the 40-49 age range.

A significant difference was found for principals in the organizational decision-making area of actual staff development decisions with the 60-69 age range having a higher mean rank than the 40-49 age range and the 60-69 age range having a higher mean rank than the 50-59 age range.

The Mann-Whitney U tests pair-wise comparison (see Appendix D) showed that respondents in the 70 and over age group had more actual participation in planning and budget.

The same age group desired less participation on pupil matters than those in the 30-39, 40-49, 50-59, and 60-69 age groups. The 30-39 age group desired more pupil participation than the 40-49 age group.

Table 14

Kruskal-Wallis Analysis of Variance Results Showing Significant Differences in Actual and Desired Levels of Participation for Groups by Age

Organizational area	Mean	Standard deviation	Cases	X^2	Probability
		Overall Summary			
Desired pupil personnel	29.75	7.57	214	12.78*	.02
Actual budget	41.32	13.76	206	11.86*	.04
Actual plant management	27.93	11.04	212	11.72*	.04

	Age group	Mean	Mean rank	S.D.	n	X^2	p
		Principals					
Desired policy	Missing	52.63		8.80	16		
	20-29	56.00	69.00	0.00	1		
	30-39	55.79	71.57	8.84	14		

	40-49	51.34	49.31	7.54	62		

Table 14 (continued)

	Age group	Mean	Mean rank	S.D.	n	X^2	p
	50-59	54.94	65.37	7.22	31		
	60-69	57.75	78.88	6.50	8		
	(Overall)	53.23		7.86	132	11.09	.03*
Actual pupil personnel	Missing	27.94		6.02	17		
	20-29	21.00	11.00	0.00	1		
	30-39	29.53	69.37	3.87	15		
	40-49	27.62	54.89	6.05	66		
	50-59	31.46	78.80	5.25	35		
	60-69	28.44	63.22	9.86	9		
	(Overall)	28.80		6.11	143	12.31	.02*
Actual staff development	Missing	22.72		4.52	18		
	20-29	20.00	45.00	0.00	1		

	30-39	22.83	69.38	6.28	16		
	40-49	20.68	55.23	5.87	65		

Table 14 (continued)

	Age group	Mean	Mean rank	S.D.	n	X^2	p
	50-59	22.69	67.96	4.54	35		
	60-69	26.25	93.94	3.01	8		
	(Overall)	21.92		5.44	143	10.32	.04*
	Central Office Personnel						
Actual pupil personnel	Missing	21.00		0.00	1		
	40-49	22.79	37.01	7.61	34		
	50-59	18.92	27.23	5.30	24		
	60-69	26.80	44.00	8.17	5		
	Over 70	12.00	6.50	0.00	2		
	(Overall)	21.33		7.20	66	9.46	.02*
Desired pupil personnel	Missing	21.00		0.00	1		

	40-49	25.93	36.62	7.56	33	
	50-59	21.50	26.23	6.98	24	
	60-69	29.40	45.40	6.88	5	

Table 14 (continued)

	Age group	Mean	Mean rank	S.D.	n	X^2	p
	Over 70	14.00	7.50	0.00	2		
	(Overall)	24.12		7.67	65	10.38	.02*
Actual budget	Missing	12.00		0.00	1		
	40-49	39.55	33.15	13.24	33		
	50-59	32.90	24.50	14.39	20		
	60-69	36.60	26.00	23.95	5		
	Over 70	67.00	58.00	0.00	2		
	(Overall)	37.57		15.70	61	8.42	.04*

* ≤ .05

Table 15

Mann-Whitney U Test Results for Significance for Principals by Age

Category	Mean rank	n	Group	z	2-tailed p
Desired policy	50.25	14	30-39		
	35.85	62	40-49	2.21	.03
	42.67	62	40-49		
	55.66	31	50-59	-2.19	.03
	33.50	62	40-49		
	51.00	8	60-69	2.29	.02
Actual pupil personnel	44.38	66	40-49		
	63.49	35	50-59	-3.12	.00
Actual staff development	34.70	65	40-49		
	55.69	8	60-69	-2.66	.01
	20.04	35	50-59		
	30.56	8	60-69	-2.16	.03

Sixty-six central office personnel responded to the survey and had the following areas with significant difference: actual pupil personnel decisions ($p = .02$), desired pupil personnel decisions ($p = .02$), and actual budget decisions ($p = .04$) (see Table 14). The areas of significant difference for central office personnel were further analyzed using the Mann-Whitney U two-variable test of analysis to determine which age category had the significant difference (see Table 16).

There was a significant difference in the organizational decision-making area for central office personnel in the area of actual pupil personnel decisions in three age range comparisons, with the 60-69 age range having a higher mean rank when compared to the over 70 age range. There was also a significant difference for central office personnel in the organizational decision-making area of actual pupil personnel decisions with the 40-49 age range having a higher mean rank when compared to the over 70 age range. Again, there was a significant difference in the organizational decision-making area for central office personnel in the area of actual pupil personnel decisions with the 40-49 age range having a higher mean rank than the 50-59 age range.

A significant difference was found for central office personnel in the organizational decision-making area of desired pupil personnel decisions in three age range

comparisons, with the 40-49 age range having a higher mean than the 50-59 age range. In the organizational decision-making area of desired pupil personnel decisions, a significant difference was found for central office personnel with the 40-49 age range having a higher mean rank than the over 70 age range. There was a significant difference in the organizational decision-making area for central office personnel, again, in the area of desired pupil personnel decisions with the 60-69 age range having a higher mean rank when compared to the 50-59 age range.

There was a significant difference for central office personnel in the organizational decision-making area of actual budget decisions with the over 70 age range having a higher mean rank when compared to the 50-59. There was a significant difference in the organizational decision-making area for central office personnel in the area of actual budget decisions with the over 70 age range having a higher mean rank than the 40-49 age range (see Table 16).

There was not a significant difference in the organizational decision-making areas for school board personnel in the age demographic. Appendix F contains survey respondent results for the entire sample, displaying the not-significant overall results and the by-position results.

Table 16

Mann-Whitney U Test Results for Significance for Central Office Personnel by Age

Category	Mean rank	n	Group	z	2-tailed p
Actual pupil personnel	5.00	5	60-69		
	1.50	2	Over 70	-1.97	.05
	19.38	34	40-49		
	3.50	2	Over 70	-2.08	.04
	33.22	34	40-49		
	24.23	24	50-59	-2.01	.05
Desired pupil personnel	33.02	33	40-49		
	23.48	24	50-59	-2.15	.03
	18.88	33	40-49		
	3.50	2	Over 70	-2.07	.04
	13.58	24	50-59		

	21.80	5	60-69	-1.97	.05

Table 16 (continued)

Category	Mean rank	n	Group	z	2-tailed p
Actual budget	10.50	20	50-59		
	21.50	2	Over 70	-2.29	.02
	17.03	33	40-49		
	34.00	2	Over 70	-2.28	.02

Two hundred twenty-two respondents' responses were analyzed in the overall analysis of educational level using the Kruskal-Wallis analysis of variance test to determine if there was a significant difference in the educational level categories responses when considering actual and desired participation in the 10 organizational decision-making areas (see Table 17).

There was a significant difference in the organizational decision-making areas of desired school and community decisions ($p = .03$), desired parental involvement decisions ($p = .00$), and staff development decisions ($p = .05$).

There was not a significant difference in the organizational decision-making areas for principals, central office personnel, nor school board chairpersons in the educational level demographic when analyzed by position. Appendix G contains survey respondent results for the entire sample, displaying the not-significant overall results and the by-position results for the demographic of educational level (see Appendix G).

Table 17

Kruskal-Wallis Analysis of Variance Results Showing Significant Differences in Actual and Desired Levels of Participation for Groups by Educational Level

Category	Mean	Standard deviation	Cases	X^2	Signif.
		Overall Summary			
Desired school/community	30.78	7.53	202	12.35	.03*
Desired parental involvement	21.37	6.57	206	17.01	.00*
Desired staff development	22.92	5.29	211	11.16	.05*

* $\leq$ .05.

Two hundred twenty-two respondents' responses were analyzed in the overall analysis of experience level using the Kruskal-Wallis analysis of variance test to determine if there was a significant difference in the experience level categories responses when considering actual and desired participation in the 10 organizational decision-making areas.

There was a significant difference in the organizational decision-making area of actual curriculum and instruction decisions.

Further analysis by position was administered using the Kruskal-Wallis analysis of variance test for the experience level of the respondents to determine if there was a significant difference in the experience level categories reponses when considering actual and desired participation in the 10 organizational decision-making areas. Sixty-six central office personnel responded to the survey and the only area in which a significant difference was found was the organizational decision-making area of overall actual planning decisions ($p = .04$) (see Table 18). All not-significantly-different organizational decision-making areas are displayed in Appendix H.

Table 18

Kruskal-Wallis Analysis of Variance Results Showing Significant Differences in Actual and Desired Levels of Participation for Groups by Experience

Category	Mean	Standard deviation	Cases	X^2	Signif.
		Overall Summary			
Actual curriculum/instruction	36.43	10.91	210	16.97	.02*

Category	Years of experience	Mean	Mean rank	S.D.	n	X^2	p
		Central Office Personnel					
Actual planning	6-10	38.00	15.00	0.00	1		
	11-15	36.00	13.00	5.57	3		
	16-20	34.63	15.31	11.45	8		
	21-25	49.00	35.53	10.17	9		
	26-30	50.13	36.75	11.42	16		
	31-40	49.00	36.00	11.32	14		
	Over 40	49.50	36.25	14.85	2		
	(Overall)	46.68		11.81	63	13.28	.04*

* ≤ .05.

The area of actual planning, having displayed a significant difference for central office personnel, was further analyzed using the Mann-Whitney U two-variable test of analysis to determine which experience level categories had the significant difference.

A significant difference was found in five experience level range comparisons, beginning with the 21-25 experience level range having a higher mean rank when compared to the 11-15 experience level range. There was also a significant difference in the organizational decision-making area of actual planning decisions with the 26-30 experience level range having a higher mean rank than the 11-15 experience level range. There was a significant difference found in the area of actual planning decisions with the 21-25 experience level range having a higher mean rank than the 16-20 experience level range. Once again, there was a significant difference in the decision-making area of actual planning decisions with the 26-30 experience level range having a higher mean rank when compared to the 16-20 experience level range. Finally, there was a significant difference in the organizational decision-making area for central office personnel in the area of actual planning decisions with the 31-40 experience level range having a higher mean rank than the 16-20 experience level range (see Table 19). All not significantly different organizational decision-making areas are displayed in Appendix H.

Table 19

Mann-Whitney U Test Results for Significance for Central Office Personnel by Experience

Category	Mean rank	n	Group	z	2-tailed p
Actual planning	4.50	3	11-15		
	12.61	19	21-25	-2.01	.05
	3.83	3	11-15		
	11.16	16	26-30	-2.07	.04
	7.69	8	16-20		
	16.66	19	21-25	-2.68	.01
	7.25	8	16-20		
	15.13	16	26-30	-2.58	.01
	6.94	8	16-20		
	14.11	14	31-40	-2.50	.01

Experience was the area with an extreme amount of significance when compared to the other demographic areas. In Appendix D, the less than 5 years of actual participation had significance in 18 areas and the 6-10 years of experience was tested using the Mann-Whitney in 23 areas of actual and desired participation in shared educational decision areas. The over 40 years of experience group desired more participation in the pupil personnel than the 31-40 years of experience group. The 26-30 group was significant compared to the over 40 years of experience group in the area of desired pupil personnel. The demographics seemed to indicate very little difference when compared to all the numerical possibilities presented in the 10 organizational areas and the several groups within the demographic areas.

Summary

A statistical analysis was completed for results from surveys returned from school board chairpersons, central office personnel, and principals pertaining to actual and desired participation in shared educational decision making in 10 educational decision-making areas. The Kruskal-Wallis one-way analysis of variance for ordinal data was administered. Areas finding significance, if more than two variables, were administered the Mann-Whitney U Test or the Wilcoxon Matched-pairs Signed-ranks Test in order to identify specific significance at the .05 level of

significance or less. The results were used to analyze research questions 1 through 5 and hypotheses 1 through 6. The principals consistently made the most significant impact on the actual compared to desired attributes of shared decision making. The demographic variables were analyzed regarding the preferences of the five demographic data areas concerning the 10 actual and the 10 desired areas of educational decision-making participation by principals, central office personnel, and school board chairpersons.

CHAPTER 5

Summary, Findings, Conclusions, and Recommendations

Introduction

The purpose of this study was to investigate the actual and desired attributes of shared decision making as viewed by school board chairpersons, central office personnel, and principals in the First Educational District of Tennessee. The following 10 categories of shared educational decisions were selected for this study: planning, policy, curriculum/ instruction, pupil personnel, staff personnel, school/ community, parental involvement, staff development, budget, and plant management. Also, demographic information was collected from all three groups to determine if their perception of shared educational decisions was influenced to a significant degree by a demographic variable. The following demographics were collected: position being either school board chairperson, central office personnel, or principal, gender, age, educational level attained, and years of experience.

This chapter will summarize data and major findings of the research study. It will also include conclusions and delineate recommendations for additional research.

Summary

The problem undergirding this study was the lack of an understanding of the actual and desired attributes

concerning shared educational decisions in the First Educational District of Tennessee. Since the development of the Master Plan for Tennessee Schools in November, 1990, the State Board of Education in section II, goal C, stated the goal of school-based decision making was to be the rule rather than the exception in schools.

The entire population in the First Educational District of Tennessee was sent a survey instrument which covered the 10 categories of shared educational decisions. The survey instrument was determined to be valid and reliable for school leaders. The 286 school leaders returned the survey at a rate of 78%. The 222 respondents included 148 principals, 66 central office personnel, and 8 of the 17 school board chairpersons.

Findings

Five research questions were formulated to ascertain the level of actual and desired participation among school leaders in the area of shared decision making in the First Eductional District of Tennessee. Research questions 1 through 3 focused upon the 10 areas of decision making and determined if each of the 3 groups surveyed (school board chairperson, central office personnel, and principals) had a difference in the actual and desired level of participation as pertaining to the areas of shared decision making. Research question 4 was concerned with the actual and desired levels of all three groups in shared decision

making. Research question 5 was concerned with the demographics of gender, age, educational level, and experience and asked if they made any difference in the actual and desired participation in shared decision making in the First Educational District of Tennessee.

Research Question 1

Research question 1 was designed to ascertain the actual and desired participation of school board chairpersons in shared decision making in 10 areas of shared educational decisions: planning, policy, curriculum/ instruction, pupil personnel, staff personnel, school/ community, parental involvement, staff development, budget and plant management. Since only 8 of the 17 school board chairpersons responded to the survey, the result was measured on its merit of less than 50% return. In the 10 areas of decision making, actual compared to desired, 3 were found to be significant at the .05 level or less. They were actual policy as compared to desired policy, actual staff compared to desired staff, and actual school compared to desired school. The 7 other areas had no significant difference between actual and desired participation among school board chairpersons.

Research Question 2

Research question 2 was designed to ascertain the actual and desired participation of central office personnel

in shared decision making in 10 areas of shared educational decisions: planning, policy, curriculum/instruction, pupil personnel, staff personnel, school/community, parental involvement, staff development, budget, and plant management. A total of 66 central office personnel responded of the 82 surveys sent in the district, for a return rate of 80%. All 10 areas were found to be significant, so there was a difference in the actual and desired participation in shared decision making among central office personnel in the First Educational District of Tennessee. Essentially, the central office personnel desired more input into shared educational decision making.

Research Question 3

Research question 3 was designed to ascertain the actual and desired participation of principals in shared decision making in 10 areas of shared educational decisions: planning, policy, curriculum/instruction, pupil personnel, staff personnel, school/community, parental involvement, staff development, budget, and plant management. A total of 148 principals responded of the 187 principals mailed surveys for a response rate of 78%. All 10 areas were found to be significant at the .05 level of significance or less. Principals desired more input into shared educational decisions than they actually have at the present time.

Research Question 4

Research question 4 was designed to ascertain differences between school board chairpersons, central office personnel, and principals in their actual/desired responses concerning participation in shared educational decisions in the First Educational District of Tennessee. Of the 20 areas (10 actual and 10 desired), 17 were found to be significant at the .05 level of significance or less. The principals, especially, desired more input into the process of shared educational decisions.

Research Question 5

Research question 5 was designed to ascertain differences among the surveyed groups pertaining to demographic areas of gender, age, educational level, and experience. Of the 1,200 numerical possibilities, 82 were found to be significant at the .05 level of significance or less. Most of the differences came in the areas of experience and education, with a few differences in age, and only one difference in gender as they pertained to the responses of actual and desired participation in shared decision making in the First Educational District of Tennessee.

Conclusions

This research contributed to the body of knowledge about actual and desired participation in 10 organizational

decision areas of shared decision making. The principals, central office personnel, and school board chairpersons in the First Educational District of Tennessee all desired more participation than they actually had in the areas of planning, policy, curriculum/instruction, pupil personnel, staff personnel, school/community, parental involvement, staff development, budget, and plant management. A further analysis of the findings led to the following conclusions:

1. School board chairpersons, central office personnel, and principals all desired more participation in shared educational decisions than they actually had at the current time.

2. School board chairpersons and central office personnel had and desired approximately the same amount of participation in shared decision making.

3. Principals had a more-than-average amount of participation in shared decision making but desired more participation opportunities.

4. Principals had much more actual participation in shared decision making than either central office personnel or school board chairpersons.

5. Female principals and male central office personnel desired more participation in the shared decision-making process.

6. Older principals and younger central office personnel had more actual participation in shared decision

making than their counterparts, and they desired even more participation.

7. Central office personnel with 20 or more years of experience had more actual participation in planning than their younger counterparts.

Overall, the results of this study suggest that much more investigation of school leaders' actual and desired attributes on shared educational decision making is needed, as well as investigations of other factors that can impact school leaders' attributes. The use of an evaluative model which measures both actual and desired attributes appears to have broadened prior treatment of the subject. Broadening the conceptualization of decision making by use of 10 categories and 92 items appears to have advanced the understanding of domains of decision making in the area of education. Further investigations would indicate whether the findings of this study can be replicated.

Recommendations

As a result of this study, the following recommendations are made:

1. A study of the principals (such as elementary, middle, and high school principals), central office personnel (the superintendent and various positions within the central office), and all school board members should be made to further explain the areas of shared educational

decision making in the 10 organizational areas included in this study by actual and desired participation.

2. School board chairpersons should be encouraged by the Tennessee State School Board to participate in surveys.

3. Principals should be given the opportunity to implement shared decision making with support by school board chairpersons, central office personnel, and superintendents.

4. Central office personnel should be given more participation in staff development.

5. School board personnel should be given more participation in the area of plant management.

6. Replication of the study on a state level would help the legislature to further determine a schedule for implementation of shared educational decision making since the knowledge, on the state level, of the actual and desired participation in the 10 organizational decision areas would give more specific direction for understanding, professional development, and implementation.

7. The State Department of Education, colleges and universities, and local education administration should make all stakeholders aware of the areas of shared educational decisions and the areas of organizational decisions. The responses of "sometimes" and "often," in most areas, should be "usually" and "always" if school-based decision making is to become a goal in this state.

8. School board chairpersons must be educated to help them understand their need to increase participation in pupil personnel both actually and desired.

9. The State Board of Education and the State Department of Education needs to be informed of desires of decision makers in the local school districts of Tennessee as related to shared decision making.

REFERENCES

References

Alutto, J. A., & Belasco, J. A. (1972). A typology for participation in organizational decision-making. Administrative Science Quarterly, 17, 117-125.

American Association of School Administrators, & National School Boards Association. (1984). Holding effective board meetings. Arlington, VA: Author.

Anthony, R. N. (1964). Framework for analysis. Management Sciences, 1, 18-24.

Bacharach, S. B., Bamberger, P., Conley, S. C., & Bauer, S. (1990). The dimensionality of decision participation in educational organizations: The value of a multi-domain evaluative approach. Educational Administration Quarterly, 26(2), 126-167.

Bacharach, S. B., Bauer, S. C., & Shedd, J. B. (1986). The work environment and school reform. Teachers College Record, 88, 241-256.

Belli, G., & VanLingen, G. (1993, Winter). A view from the field after one year of school-based management. ERS Spectrum, pp. 31-38.

Best, J. W. (1975). A means of measuring teacher participation in decision-making. The Clearing House, 49, 26-27.

Bolman, L. G., & Deal, T. E. (1984). Modern approaches to understanding and managing organizations. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Boschee, F., Uhl, P. L., & Bonaiuto, J. A. (1993, Winter). Barriers to site based management and shared decision making as perceived by school board presidents and school administrators. ERS Spectrum, pp. 22-26.

Bridges, E. M. (1967). A model for shared decision-making in the school principalship. Educational Administration Quarterly, 3, 49-61.

Conley, S. C. (1991). Review of research on teacher participation in school decision making. In G. Grant (Ed.), Review of research in education (pp. 225-266). Washington, DC: American Educational Research Association.

Conley, S. C., & Bacharach, S. B. (1990). From school-site management to participatory school-site management. Phi Delta Kappan, 71, 539-544.

Conley, S. C., Schmidle, T., & Shedd, J. B. (1988). Teacher participation in the management of school systems. Teachers College Record, 90(2), 259-280.

Conway, J. A. (1976). Test of linearity between teachers' participation in decision making and their perceptions of their schools as organizations. Administrative Science Quarterly, 21, 130-139.

David, J. L. (1989). Synthesis of research on school-based management. Educational Leadership, 46(1), 45-53.

Dewey, J. (1916). Democracy and education. New York: The Free Press.

Elmore, R. (1978). Organizational models of social program implementation. In D. Mann (Ed.), Making change happen? (pp. 185-223). New York: Columbia University, Teachers College Press.

Etheridge, C. P., & Hall, M. L. (April, 1991). The nature, role, and effect of competition, cooperation in multiple site implementation of site-based decision making. Memphis, TN: Memphis State University, Center for Research in Educational Policy, College of Education.

Ferrara, D. L. (1993). Teacher perceptions of participation in shared decision making in New York state. (Doctoral dissertation, New York University, 1992). Dissertation Abstracts International 53, 11A3747.

Ferrara, D. L., & Repa, J. T. (1993). Measuring shared decision making. Educational Leadership, 51(2), 71-72.

Firestone, W. A. (1977). Participation and influence in the planning of educational change. Journal of Applied Behavioral Science, 13(2), 167-187.

Firestone, W. A., & Corbett, H. D. (1988). Planned organizational change. In N. J. Boyan (Ed.), Handbook of research on educational administration (pp. 14-21). White Plains, NY: Longman.

Giacquinta, J. B. (1973). The process of organizational change in schools. In F. Kerlinger (Ed.), Review of Research in Education (pp. 29-37). Itasca, IL: Peacock.

Goodman, J. (1994). External change agents and grassroots school reform: Reflections from the field. Journal of Curriculum and Supervision, 9(2), 113-135.

Guthrie, J. W. (1986). School-based management: The next needed educational reform. Phi Delta Kappan, 67, 305-309.

Guthrie, J. W., & Craig, P. A. (1976). Who controls the schools? In A. C. Ornstein & S. I. Miller (Eds.), Policy issues in education (pp. 31-35). Lexington, MA: D. C. Heath.

Hanson, E. M. (1991). Educational administration and organizational behavior (3rd ed.). Needham Heights, MA: Allyn & Bacon.

Haywood, N. D. F. (1993). The impact of site-based management on perceived roles of superintendents, board chairpersons, principals and selected central office personnel in Tennessee school systems. (Doctoral dissertation, East Tennessee State University, Johnson City, 1992). Dissertation Abstracts International, 53, 11A3750.

Hinkle, D. E., Wiersma, W., & Jurs, S. G. (1988). Applied statistics for the behavioral sciences. Boston: Houghton-Mifflin.

Ho, W. K. (1982). Decision domains and staff participation: A study of teacher-principal relationships in primary schools (Doctoral dissertation, University of Chicago, 1982). Dissertation Abstracts International, 42, 12A4979.

Hoy, W. K., & Miskel, C. G. (1991). Educational administration: Theory, research and practice (4th ed.). New York: Random House.

Joslin, A. W. (1983). The effect of school context on the implementation of an innovation: A case study. (Doctoral dissertation, The University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill, 1983). Dissertation Abstracts International, 43, 5A1409.

Katz, D., & Kahn, R. L. (1966). The social psychology of organizations. New York: Wiley.

Keehn, J. (1991, October). How business helps the schools. Fortune Magazine, pp. 47-49.

Kerr, T. J. (1991, February). Site-based solutions: Are they working? School and College, pp. 12-19.

Kirst, M. (1977, February 21). Sharing policy decisions. Education U.S.A., p. 188.

Knezevich, S. J. (1984). Administration of public education--A sourcebook for the leadership and management of educational institutions (4th ed.). New York: Harper & Row.

Likert, R. (1961). New patterns of management. New York: McGraw-Hill.

Lortie, D. C. (1969). The balance of control and autonomy in elementary school teaching. In A. Etzioni (Ed.), The semi-professions and their organization (pp. 1-53). New York: Free Press.

Malen, B., Ogawa, R. T., & Kranz, T. J. (1990). Evidence says site-based management hindered by many factors. The School Administrator 47(2), 53-56.

Mann, D. (Ed.). (1978). Making change happen? New York: Columbia University, Teachers College Press.

Marburger, C. L. (1985). One school at a time school-based management, a process for change. Columbia, MD: The National Committee for Citizens in Education.

Mohrman, A. M., Jr., Cooke, R. A., & Mohrman, S. A. (1978). Participation in decision making: A multidimensional perspective. Educational Administration Quarterly, 14, 13-29.

Musco, R. S. (1992). The relationship between teacher perceptions of their participation in decision making and the behavior of high school teachers in New York City. (Doctoral dissertation, New York University, 1992). Dissertation Abstracts International, 53, 3A679.

National Commission on Excellence in Educational Administration. (1987). Leaders for America's schools. Tempe, AZ: University Council for Educational Administration.

National School Board Association. (1987). Becoming a better board member. Alexandria, VA: Author.

Norusis, M. N. (1990). The statistical package for the social sciences--personal computer [Computer program, version 4.0]. Chicago: SPSS.

O'Neil, J. (1990). Piecing together the restructuring puzzle. Educational Leadership, 47(7), 4-10.

Pajak, E. (1993). Change and continuity in supervision and leadership. In G. Cawelti (Ed.), Challenges and Achievement of American Education. The 1993 ASCD Yearbook (pp. 158-186). Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.

Parsons, T. (1958). Some ingredients of general theory of formal organization. In W. A. Halpin (Ed.), Administrative theory in education (pp. 40-72). New York: Macmillan.

Peterson, P. E. (1976). School politics Chicago style. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Plath, K. R., & Perry, H. J. (1977). The annual school plan. Reston, VA: National Association of Secondary School Principals.

Ravitch, D. (1984). A good school. In F. Schultz (Ed.), Education 88/89 (pp. 55-60). Guilford, CT: Dushkin.

Richardson, M. D. (1988). The evolution of principals' roles. Tennessee School Board Journal, 5(3), 16-18.

Rundell, C. R. (1992). NASDC: A businessman's experience. Phi Delta Kappan, 73, 291, 293.

Sergiovanni, T. J. (1990). Value-added leadership: How to get extraordinary performance in schools. San Diego: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich.

Simon, H. A. (1960). The new science of management decision. New York: Harper & Brothers.

Sirotnik, K. A., & Clark, R. W. (1988). School-centered decision making and renewal. Phi Delta Kappan, 69, 660-664.

Snyder, K. J., & Giella, M. (1988). Managing productive district programs: A job model for instructional supervisors. Wingspan, 4(2), 34-39.

Sprott, R. A. (1983). A study of shared decision making among the principal, teachers and parents. (Doctoral dissertation, Columbia University Teachers College, New York, 1983). Dissertation Abstracts International, 44, 11A3273.

Stuckwisch, D. C. (1987). Patterns of participative decision-making: A study of high schools that promote decision sharing practices (influences, mechanisms, domains). (Doctoral dissertation, Virginia Commonwealth University, Richmond, 1986). Dissertation Abstracts International, 47, 7A2411.

Tennessee School Boards Association. (1988). New board member orientation manual. Nashville, TN: Author.

Tennessee State Board of Education. (1990). Master plan for Tennessee schools--Preparing for the twenty-first century. Nashville, TN: Author.

Tennessee State Board of Education. (1993). Master plan for Tennessee schools, 1994, preparing for the 21st century. Nashville, TN: Author.

Tennessee State Department of Education. (1994). 1993-94 Director of Public Schools. Nashville, TN: Author.

Valesky, T. C., Forsythe, G., & Hall, M. L. (1992). Principal perceptions of school-based decision making in Tennessee schools. Memphis, TN: Memphis State University, Center for Research in Educational Policy.

Valesky, T. C., Smith, D., & Fitzgerald, J. (1990). School-based decision making in Tennessee public schools. Memphis, TN: Memphis State University, Center for Research in Educational Policy.

Vroom, V. H., & Jago, A. G. (1988). The new leadership: Managing participation in organizations. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Vroom, V. H., & Yetton, P. W. (1973). Leadership and decision-making. Pittsburgh: University of Pittsburgh Press.

Webster's new collegiate dictionary (9th ed.). (1991). Springfield, MA: Merriam-Webster.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A

MASTER PLAN FOR TENNESSEE SCHOOLS, 1990

Master Plan for Tennessee Schools, 1990

The Goal:

School-Based Decision Making will be the rule rather than the exception in schools.

Current Situation:

The quality of schools in Tennessee varies considerably. A few school systems have experimented with shared decision making. For schools to be effective, those closest to the situation must have the authority to fashion programs to meet the needs of the students.

Strategies:

1. Implement school-based decision making by authorizing school boards, superintendents, principals, teachers, parents and community leaders to fulfill enlarged roles as decision makers in the schools within the limits established by law and policy.

Implementation Schedule: To be implemented upon legislative action in 1991. Phase in all schools within 4 years.

2. Provide staff development opportunities and resources to local educators to enable them to implement school-based decision making. Establish ten schools as model demonstration sites in school-based decision making.

Implementation Schedule: Provide staff development through the professional package beginning in FY 92. Initiate model demonstration sites in FY 92.

3. Involve teachers in decision making in schools in regard to curriculum, textbooks, discipline, professional development, and other matters related to the teaching-learning process.

Implementation Schedule: Provide staff development through the professional development package beginning in FY 92.

4. Make parents and community leaders active partners with school boards in the development of educational goals; involve parents in the school-based decision making process.

Implementation Schedule: Provide training through the professional development package beginning in FY 92.

5. Develop state-level programs designed to instill positive attitudes and high self-esteem among all individuals who work and study in local schools.

Implementation Schedule: Is being implemented.

Indicators of Progress:

1. Number of schools implementing school-based decision making.

2. Student performance in TCAP, absentees, retentions, dropouts and other assessments in schools that have implemented school-based decision making.

3. Attitude of school personnel and community leaders as determined by survey.

APPENDIX B

SURVEY INSTRUMENT

SHARED DECISION MAKING SURVEY

Dear First District School Leader,

I am in need of your assistance. I am a doctoral student at East Tennessee State University. Currently, I am also the Principal of Unicoi County Middle School. You have been selected as a school leader in the First Educational District of Tennessee to participate in a study concerning shared decision making in the public schools. The purpose of the study is to discover the actual and desired attributes in the area of shared decision making. I am asking for your responses. There are no right or wrong answers. Your returned survey responses will be added to those of your peers and the results will be shared with you, if you request. All responses to this survey will be anonymous. Your name on the return address is for my information gathering purposes ONLY.

Please return the completed survey in the stamped self-addressed envelope by January 15, 1994. Thank you for participating in this survey. Your professionalism and assistance to a fellow colleague are greatly appreciated. If you would like further information, you may call Allen Rogers at 743-4912, or write 326 Carolina Avenue, Erwin, TN 37650-1704. Thanks!

SHARED EDUCATION DECISIONS SURVEY©

This survey is designed to obtain perceptions concerning involvement in shared decision making. For the following items, please indicate by **CIRCLING** the appropriate response in each column:

1. how frequently you perceive you are involved in making each decision (**Actual** column) and
2. how frequently you would like to be involved in making each decision (**Desired** column).

It is important that you attempt to provide a response in <u>both</u> columns for each item. Except where indicated by the wording of a particular item, respond to each item as it applies only to a building-level decision.

KEY: 1 = Never, 2 = Rarely, 3 = Sometimes, 4 = Often, 5 = Usually, 6 = Always

	ACTUAL						DESIRED					
	NEVER	RARELY	SOMETIMES	OFTEN	USUALLY	ALWAYS	NEVER	RARELY	SOMETIMES	OFTEN	USUALLY	ALWAYS
<u>Planning</u>												
1. Designing change initiatives at the district level.....	1	2	3	4	5	6	1	2	3	4	5	6
2. Designing change initiatives at the building level.....	1	2	3	4	5	6	1	2	3	4	5	6
3. Developing a district philosophy statement.....	1	2	3	4	5	6	1	2	3	4	5	6
4. Developing a school philosophy statement.....	1	2	3	4	5	6	1	2	3	4	5	6
5. Setting district-level goals.....	1	2	3	4	5	6	1	2	3	4	5	6

Appendix B (continued)

6.	Setting building-level goals.....	1 2 3 4 5 6	1 2 3 4 5 6
7.	Planning long-term district-level educational improvements.....	1 2 3 4 5 6	1 2 3 4 5 6
8.	Planning long-term building-level educational improvements.....	1 2 3 4 5 6	1 2 3 4 5 6
9.	Planning short-term district-level educational improvements.....	1 2 3 4 5 6	1 2 3 4 5 6
10.	Planning short-term building-level educational improvements.....	1 2 3 4 5 6	1 2 3 4 5 6
11.	Determining who will be involved in district-wide change initiatives.....	1 2 3 4 5 6	1 2 3 4 5 6
12.	Determining who will be involved in school-wide change initiatives.....	1 2 3 4 5 6	1 2 3 4 5 6
Policy			
13.	Setting guidelines for homework.....	1 2 3 4 5 6	1 2 3 4 5 6
14.	Setting guidelines for student conduct, discipline	1 2 3 4 5 6	1 2 3 4 5 6
15.	Determining guidelines for student retention.....	1 2 3 4 5 6	1 2 3 4 5 6
16.	Determining student grading practices.....	1 2 3 4 5 6	1 2 3 4 5 6
17.	Establishing student attendance policies.....	1 2 3 4 5 6	1 2 3 4 5 6
18.	Setting guidelines for student testing and assessment.....	1 2 3 4 5 6	1 2 3 4 5 6

Appendix B (continued)

19.	Determining specific standardized tests and other forms of student assessments.....	1 2 3 4 5 6	1 2 3 4 5 6
20.	Establishing academic eligibility policies for student participation in extracurricular activities.	1 2 3 4 5 6	1 2 3 4 5 6
21.	Setting guidelines for evaluation of administrators.....	1 2 3 4 5 6	1 2 3 4 5 6
22.	Setting guidelines for evaluation of teachers.....	1 2 3 4 5 6	1 2 3 4 5 6
23.	Setting guidelines for evaluation of educational support personnel.....	1 2 3 4 5 6	1 2 3 4 5 6
	Curriculum/Instruction		
24.	Choosing content/program areas for curriculum development.....	1 2 3 4 5 6	1 2 3 4 5 6
25.	Choosing content for inclusion in curriculum documents.....	1 2 3 4 5 6	1 2 3 4 5 6
26.	Selecting textbooks.....	1 2 3 4 5 6	1 2 3 4 5 6
27.	Selecting instructional materials.....	1 2 3 4 5 6	1 2 3 4 5 6
28.	Determining changes in course offerings.....	1 2 3 4 5 6	1 2 3 4 5 6
29.	Determining teaching methodologies.....	1 2 3 4 5 6	1 2 3 4 5 6
30.	Evaluating programs.....	1 2 3 4 5 6	1 2 3 4 5 6
31.	Evaluating curriculum.....	1 2 3 4 5 6	1 2 3 4 5 6
32.	Evaluating textbooks.....	1 2 3 4 5 6	1 2 3 4 5 6

Appendix B (continued)

33.	Designing new academic programs.....	1 2 3 4 5 6	1 2 3 4 5 6
Pupil Personnel			
34.	Determining student placement for instructional programs.....	1 2 3 4 5 6	1 2 3 4 5 6
35.	Determining recommended student class size.....	1 2 3 4 5 6	1 2 3 4 5 6
36.	Determining methods of reporting student progress to parents.....	1 2 3 4 5 6	1 2 3 4 5 6
37.	Helping to solve a student's academic problems.....	1 2 3 4 5 6	1 2 3 4 5 6
38.	Helping to solve a student's personal problems.....	1 2 3 4 5 6	1 2 3 4 5 6
39.	Choosing student support services administered by guidance.....	1 2 3 4 5 6	1 2 3 4 5 6
40.	Determining pupils who are given commendations, awards, and scholarships...	1 2 3 4 5 6	1 2 3 4 5 6
Staff Personnel			
41.	Hiring district administrators.....	1 2 3 4 5 6	1 2 3 4 5 6
42.	Hiring building administrators.....	1 2 3 4 5 6	1 2 3 4 5 6
43.	Hiring instructional personnel.....	1 2 3 4 5 6	1 2 3 4 5 6
44.	Hiring educational support personnel.....	1 2 3 4 5 6	1 2 3 4 5 6
45.	Selecting department heads.	1 2 3 4 5 6	1 2 3 4 5 6
46.	Orientating new personnel..	1 2 3 4 5 6	1 2 3 4 5 6

Appendix B (continued)

47.	Assigning teaching duties..	1 2 3 4 5 6	1 2 3 4 5 6
48.	Determining duty assignments.....	1 2 3 4 5 6	1 2 3 4 5 6
49.	Granting tenure to administrators.....	1 2 3 4 5 6	1 2 3 4 5 6
50.	Granting tenure to teachers	1 2 3 4 5 6	1 2 3 4 5 6
51.	Reducing staff.....	1 2 3 4 5 6	1 2 3 4 5 6
52.	Assigning staff to committees.....	1 2 3 4 5 6	1 2 3 4 5 6
53.	Planning agendas for staff meetings.....	1 2 3 4 5 6	1 2 3 4 5 6
54.	Resolving employee grievances.....	1 2 3 4 5 6	1 2 3 4 5 6
School/Community Relations			
55.	Involving community/civic groups in school activities.....	1 2 3 4 5 6	1 2 3 4 5 6
56.	Involving business groups in school activities.....	1 2 3 4 5 6	1 2 3 4 5 6
57.	Selecting community or business representatives for involvement in school committees.....	1 2 3 4 5 6	1 2 3 4 5 6
58.	Determining content of school news released to the media.....	1 2 3 4 5 6	1 2 3 4 5 6
59.	Determining the extent of influence citizen committees have over school decisions.	1 2 3 4 5 6	1 2 3 4 5 6
60.	Distributing outside resources within the school.....	1 2 3 4 5 6	1 2 3 4 5 6

Appendix B (continued)

61.	Resolving difficulties with community/business groups.....	1	2	3	4	5	6	1	2	3	4	5	6
Parental Involvement													
62.	Selecting parents for involvement in school committees.....	1	2	3	4	5	6	1	2	3	4	5	6
63.	Selecting parents for involvement in shared decision making committees or councils.....	1	2	3	4	5	6	1	2	3	4	5	6
64.	Determining the amount of influence the PTA will have on school functioning.....	1	2	3	4	5	6	1	2	3	4	5	6
65.	Setting agenda items for parent meetings.....	1	2	3	4	5	6	1	2	3	4	5	6
66.	Resolving parental complaints.....	1	2	3	4	5	6	1	2	3	4	5	6
Staff Development													
67.	Assigning staff to staff development committees.....	1	2	3	4	5	6	1	2	3	4	5	6
68.	Carrying out staff development needs assessments.....	1	2	3	4	5	6	1	2	3	4	5	6
69.	Designing staff development committees.....	1	2	3	4	5	6	1	2	3	4	5	6
70.	Implementing staff development actitivies.....	1	2	3	4	5	6	1	2	3	4	5	6
71.	Specifying staff development evaluation activities.....	1	2	3	4	5	6	1	2	3	4	5	6
Budget													
72.	Formulating the district-level budget.....	1	2	3	4	5	6	1	2	3	4	5	6

Appendix B (continued)

73.	Formulating building-level budgets.....	1 2 3 4 5 6	1 2 3 4 5 6
74.	Formulating department/ grade-level budgets.....	1 2 3 4 5 6	1 2 3 4 5 6
75.	Allocating monies for textbooks.....	1 2 3 4 5 6	1 2 3 4 5 6
76.	Allocating monies for curriculum development.....	1 2 3 4 5 6	1 2 3 4 5 6
77.	Allocating monies for plant decisions.....	1 2 3 4 5 6	1 2 3 4 5 6
78.	Managing the district-level budget.....	1 2 3 4 5 6	1 2 3 4 5 6
79.	Managing the building-level budget.....	1 2 3 4 5 6	1 2 3 4 5 6
80.	Managing department/grade-level budgets.....	1 2 3 4 5 6	1 2 3 4 5 6
81.	Cutting monies from the district-level budget.....	1 2 3 4 5 6	1 2 3 4 5 6
82.	Cutting monies from the building-level budget.....	1 2 3 4 5 6	1 2 3 4 5 6
83.	Cutting monies from department/grade-level budgets.....	1 2 3 4 5 6	1 2 3 4 5 6

Plant Management

84.	Determining priority use of school facilities.....	1 2 3 4 5 6	1 2 3 4 5 6
85.	Determining the choice of capital projects.....	1 2 3 4 5 6	1 2 3 4 5 6
86.	Determining the scheduling of capital projects.....	1 2 3 4 5 6	1 2 3 4 5 6
87.	Determining priorities for facilities planning.....	1 2 3 4 5 6	1 2 3 4 5 6

Appendix B (continued)

88. Determining priorities for facilities maintenance..... 1 2 3 4 5 6 1 2 3 4 5 6

89. Determining busing schedules..... 1 2 3 4 5 6 1 2 3 4 5 6

90. Determining bus routes..... 1 2 3 4 5 6 1 2 3 4 5 6

91. Determining the number of buses utilized for student transportation..... 1 2 3 4 5 6 1 2 3 4 5 6

92. Determining the hours of the school schedule..... 1 2 3 4 5 6 1 2 3 4 5 6

93. Please circle your current position:

a. School Board Chairperson
b. Central Office Personnel
(Please state title _____)
c. Principal - (Please check current position)
____ Elementary ____ Middle ____ Secondary

94. Your sex: _____ Male _____ Female

95. Your Age: _____

96. Professional education experience, in years: _____

97. Check the highest academic degree you hold:

a. ____ B.S. b. ____ M.A. c. ____ M.A. + 45

d. ____ Ed. S. e. ____ Ed.D. or Ph.D. f. ____ Other

APPENDIX C

OVERALL MEANS BY POSITION FOR ACTUAL AND DESIRED AREAS

Appendix C

Overall Means by Position for Actual and Desired Areas

Category	Mean			
	Population	Prin	Cent Off	SchBdCh
Actual planning	48.66	49.55	46.68	48.43
Actual policy	39.56	39.78	38.88	41.29
Actual curriculum/ instruction	36.40	36.78	36.14	31.88
Actual pupil personnel	26.12	28.80	21.33	17.63
Actual staff personnel	52.50	55.68	46.49	43.29
Actual school/ community	27.60	29.72	23.21	25.38
Actual parental involvement	19.85	22.67	14.58	13.88
Actual staff development	21.14	21.92	20.39	13.25
Actual budget	41.32	42.74	37.57	45.88*
Actual plant management	27.93	28.84	24.45	39.87*
Desired planning	57.19	59.20	53.24	54.13
Desired policy	50.58	53.23	45.21	49.00
Desired curriculum/ instruction	43.84	45.40	40.84	40.13
Desired pupil personnel	29.75	32.94	24.12	19.25

Appendix C (continued)

Category	Mean			
	Population	Prin	Cent Off	SchBdCh
Desired staff personnel	62.13	65.96	55.05	52.33
Desired school/ community	30.78	33.26	25.75	28.86
Desired parental involvement	21.37	24.30	15.95	15.25
Desired staff development	22.86	24.10	21.20*	14.63
Desired budget	48.89	52.40	40.77	47.71
Desired plant management	35.97	38.88	28.71	42.00

Note. Prin = Principals; Cent Off = Central Office Personnel; SchBdCh = School Board Chairpersons.

APPENDIX D

MANN-WHITNEY U TESTS PAIR-WISE COMPARISON

Category	Demographic/Group	2-tailed p
DBUDGET	SEX FEMALE	.0230
APLANT	AGE 60-69 & *70 AND OVER	.0103
APLANT	AGE 50-59 & *70 AND OVER	.0015
APLANT	AGE 40-49 & *70 AND OVER	.0018
APLANT	AGE 30-39 & *70 AND OVER	.0033
ABUDGET	AGE 60-69 & *70 AND OVER	.0336
ABUDGET	AGE 50-59 & *70 AND OVER	.0066
ABUDGET	AGE 40-49 & *70 AND OVER	.0099
ABUDGET	AGE 30-39 & *70 AND OVER	.0106
DPUPIL	AGE *60-69 & 70 AND OVER	.0122
DPUPIL	AGE *50-59 & 70 AND OVER	.0233
DPUPIL	AGE *40-49 & 70 AND OVER	.0142
DPUPIL	AGE *30-39 & 70 AND OVER	.0065
DPUPIL	AGE *30-39 & 40-49	.0354
APARENT	EDUCATION *MA+45 & EDD	.0389
DPARENT	EDUCATION *MA+45 & EDD	.0112
ASCHOOL	EDUCATION *EDS & EDD	.0494
DSCHOOL	EDUCATION *EDS & EDD	.0314
DPARENT	EDUCATION *EDS & EDD	.0177
APUPIL	EDUCATION *MA+45 & OTHER	.0483
DPUPIL	EDUCATION *MA+45 & OTHER	.0393
DSCHOOL	EDUCATION *MA & EDD	.0015
APARENT	EDUCATION *MA & EDD	.0243
DPARENT	EDUCATION *MA & EDD	.0004
DSTAFDEV	EDUCATION *MA & EDD	.0398

Appendix D (continued)

DPLANT	EDUCATION *MA & EDD	.0085
DPLAN	EDUCATION BS & *MA	.0323
DPLAN	EDUCATION BS & .EDS	.0473
DPLAN	EDUCATION BS & *EDD	.0460
DSCHOOL	EDUCATION *MA & MA+45	.0417
DPUPIL	EDUCATION *EDS & OTHER	.0190
APARENT	EDUCATION *EDS & OTHER	.0424
DPARENT	EDUCATION *EDS & OTHER	.0324
ACURR	EXPERIENCE <5 ^ *31-40 YEARS	.0188
ASTAFF	EXPERIENCE <5 & *31-40 YEARS	.0453
ACURR	EXPERIENCE <5 & *26-30 YEARS	.0079
APUPIL	EXPERIENCE <5 & *26-30 YEARS	.0232
ASTAFF	EXPERIENCE <5 & *26-30 YEARS	.0374
ASTAFDEV	EXPERIENCE <5 & *26-30 YEARS	.0256
DSTAFDEV	EXPERIENCE <5 & *26-30 YEARS	.0278
ACURR	EXPERIENCE <5 & *21-25 YEARS	.0225
APUPIL	EXPERIENCE <5 & *21-25 YEARS	.0195
ASTAFF	EXPERIENCE <5 & *21-25 YEARS	.0307
ASTAFDEV	EXPERIENCE <5 & *21-25 YEARS	.0283
DSTAFDEV	EXPERIENCE <5 & *21-25 YEARS	.0338
ACURR	EXPERIENCE <5 & *16-20 YEARS	.0273
DSTAFDEV	EXPERIENCE <5 & *16-20 YEARS	.0473
ACURR	EXPERIENCE <5 & *11-15 YEARS	.0489
APUPIL	EXPERIENCE <5 & *11-15 YEARS	.0124

Appendix D (continued)

ASTAFF	EXPERIENCE <5 & *11-15 YEARS	.0119
ASTAFDEV	EXPERIENCE <5 & *11-15 YEARS	.0424
APOLICY	EXPERIENCE 6-10 & *11-15 YEARS	.0207
DCURR	EXPERIENCE 6-10 & *11-15 YEARS	.0111
ASTAFF	EXPERIENCE 6-10 & *11-15 YEARS	.0477
APOLICY	EXPERIENCE 6-10 & *16-20 YEARS	.0388
ACURR	EXPERIENCE 6-10 & *16-20 YEARS	.0311
DCURR	EXPERIENCE 6-10 & *16-20 YEARS	.0207
APLAN	EXPERIENCE 6-10 & *21-25 YEARS	.0294
APOLICY	EXPERIENCE 6-10 & *21-25 YEARS	.0073
ACURR	EXPERIENCE 6-10 & *21-25 YEARS	.0199
DCURR	EXPERIENCE 6-10 & *21-25 YEARS	.0132
DSTAFF	EXPERIENCE 6-10 & *21-25 YEARS	.0360
APLAN	EXPERIENCE 6-10 & *26-30 YEARS	.0497
APOLICY	EXPERIENCE 6-10 & *26-30 YEARS	.0168
ACURR	EXPERIENCE 6-10 & *26-30 YEARS	.0095
DCURR	EXPERIENCE 6-10 & *26-30 YEARS	.0464
APLAN	EXPERIENCE 6-10 & *OVER 40 YEARS	.0304
DSTAFF	EXPERIENCE 6-10 & *OVER 40 YEARS	.0249
APLAN	EXPERIENCE 6-10 & *31-40 YEARS	.0414
APOLICY	EXPERIENCE 6-10 & *31-40 YEARS	.0221
ASTAFF	EXPERIENCE 6-10 & *31-40 YEARS	.0472
ASTAFF	EXPERIENCE <5 & *OVER 40 YEARS	.0321
ASTAFDEV	EXPERIENCE <5 & *OVER 40 YEARS	.0242

Appendix D (continued)

DSTAFDEV	EXPERIENCE <5 & *OVER 40 YEARS	.0288
DSCHOOL	EXPERIENCE *16-20 & 21-25 YEARS	.0326
ASTAFDEV	EXPERIENCE 16-20 & *OVER 40 YEARS	.0386
DCURR	EXPERIENCE *16-20 & 31-40 YEARS	.0494
DCURR	EXPERIENCE *21-25 & 31-40 YEARS	.0313
ASTAFDEV	EXPERIENCE 21-25 & *OVER 40 YEARS	.0320
DSTAFDEV	EXPERIENCE 21-25 & *OVER 40 YEARS	.0472
DPUPIL	EXPERIENCE *26-30 & 31-40 YEARS	.0421
DPUPIL	EXPERIENCE 31-40 & *OVER 40 YEARS	.0377

Note. DBUDGET = Desired budget
APLANT = Actual plant management
ABUDGET = Actual budget
DPUPIL = Desired pupil personnel
APARENT = Actual parental involvement
DPARENT = Desired parental involvement
ASCHOOL = Actual school/community
DSCHOOL = Desired school/community
APUPIL = Actual pupil personnel
DPUPIL = Desired pupil personnel
DSTAFDEV = Desired staff development
DPLANT = Desired plant management
DPLAN = Desired planning
ACURR = Actual curriculum/instruction
ASTAFF = Actual staff personnel
ASTAFDEV = Actual staff development
APOLICY = Actual policy
DCURR = Desired curriculum/instruction
APLAN = Actual planning
DSTAFF = Desired staff personnel

(* = group causing the significance, based on mean)

APPENDIX E

MANN-WHITNEY U TESTS RESULTS BY GENDER

Appendix E

Mann-Whitney U Test Results by Gender

Organizational area	Gender	Mean rank	Mean	Cases	z	2-tailed p
		Principals				
Actual planning	M	70.29	49.30	112		
	F	76.02	50.47	30	-.68	.50
Desired planning	M	64.20	58.52	108		
	F	81.21	62.04	26	-2.01*	.04
Actual policy	M	72.93	40.00	114		
	F	68.33	38.97	29	-.54	.59
Desired policy	M	63.66	52.62	107		
	F	78.66	55.88	25	-1.77	.08
Actual curriculum/instruction	M	68.81	36.19	113		
	F	79.82	39.14	28	-1.28	.20
Desired curriculum/instruction	M	65.42	44.51	109		
	F	84.84	48.72	29	-2.33*	.02

Appendix E (continued)

Organizational area	Gender	Mean rank	Mean Cases	z	2-tailed p
Actual pupil personnel	M	71.22	28.73	113	
	F	74.93	29.10	30 -.44	.66
Desired pupil personnel	M	67.54	32.49	112	
	F	84.34	34.69	29 -1.98	*.05
Actual staff personnel	M	64.84	55.82	104	
	F	63.02	55.08	24 -.22	.83
Desired staff personnel	M	59.05	65.72	100	
	F	65.00	67.21	19 -.69	.49
Actual school/community	M	66.00	29.05	111	
	F	85.86	32.36	28 -2.33	*.02
Desired school/community	M	62.64	32.63	107	
	F	84.96	35.88	26 -2.66	*.01
Actual parental involvement	M	67.04	22.22	112	
	F	84.34	24.46	28 -2.03	*.04

Appendix E (continued)

Organizational area	Gender	rank	Mean	Cases	z	2-tailed p
Desired parental involvement	M	65.19	23.99	109		
	F	79.79	25.58	26	-1.71	.09
Actual staff development	M	67.69	21.34	114		
	F	88.95	24.21	29	-2.48*	.01
Desired staff development	M	66.64	23.66	113		
	F	86.65	25.89	27	-2.32*	.02
Actual budget	M	66.71	41.74	111		
	F	80.98	46.89	27	-1.66	.10
Desired budget	M	67.19	52.27	108		
	F	68.81	52.96	26	-.19	.85
Actual Plant management	M	67.31	28.07	112		
	F	83.25	31.93	28	-1.86	.06
Desired plant management	M	67.40	38.42	110		
	F	77.77	40.71	28	-1.23	.22

Appendix E (continued)

Organizational area	Gender	rank	Mean	Cases	z	2-tailed p
Central Office Personnel						
Actual planning	M	37.10	49.92	39		
	F	23.71	41.42	24	-2.82*	.00
Desired planning	M	35.04	54.74	39		
	F	25.50	50.70	23	-2.01*	.04
Actual policy	M	35.87	40.93	42		
	F	27.76	35.13	23	-1.65	.10
Desired policy	M	33.23	45.79	42		
	F	29.55	44.05	21	-.75	.45
Actual curriculum/instruction	M	31.14	35.33	40		
	F	34.77	37.50	24	-.76	.45
Desired curriculum/instruction	M	29.44	39.41	39		
	F	35.00	43.26	23	-1.17	.24

Appendix E (continued)

Organizational area	Gender	rank	Mean	Cases	z	2-tailed p
Actual pupil personnel	M	33.64	21.74	42		
	F	33.25	20.63	24	-.08	.94
Desired pupil personnel	M	31.65	23.61	41		
	F	35.51	25.00	24	-.76	.45
Actual staff personnel	M	31.35	48.65	37		
	F	24.65	42.50	20	-1.46	.15
Desired staff personnel	M	29.38	55.51	39		
	F	26.47	54.00	17	-.62	.54
Actual school/community	M	37.09	25.45	40		
	F	23.15	19.30	23	-2.91*	.00
Desired school/community	M	36.77	27.51	41		
	F	23.11	22.45	22	-2.82*	.00
Actual parental involvement	M	37.96	15.86	42		
	F	25.69	12.33	24	-2.51*	.01

Appendix E (continued)

Organizational area	Gender	rank	Mean	Cases	z	2-tailed p
Desired parental involvement	M	35.24	16.93	42		
	F	27.27	14.09	22	-1.64	.10
Actual staff development	M	33.39	20.59	41		
	F	30.91	20.04	23	-.51	.61
Desired staff development	M	31.66	20.68	41		
	F	34.00	22.13	23	-.48	.63
Actual budget	M	34.08	40.55	38		
	F	25.91	32.65	23	-1.74	.08
Desired budget	M	31.77	43.43	35		
	F	24.59	36.55	22	-1.59	.11
Actual plant management	M	37.35	27.83	41		
	F	23.85	18.43	23	-2.79*	.01
Desired plant management	M	35.47	31.63	40		
	F	24.27	23.41	22	-2.34*	.02

Appendix E (continued)

Organizational area	Gender	rank	Mean	Cases	z	2-tailed p
School Board Chairpersons						
Actual planning	M	4.30	49.20	5		
	F	3.25	46.50	2	-.59	.56
Desired planning	M	4.00	51.20	5		
	F	5.33	59.00	3	-.75	.46
Actual policy	M	4.38	44.00	4		
	F	3.50	37.67	3	-.54	.59
Desired policy	M	4.75	51.00	4		
	F	3.00	46.33	3	-1.06	.29
Actual curriculum/instruction	M	4.90	36.00	5		
	F	3.83	23.67	3	-.60	.55
Desired curriculum/instruction	M	5.40	42.60	5		
	F	3.00	36.00	3	-1.34	.18

Appendix E (continued)

Organizational area	Gender	rank	Mean	Cases	z	2-tailed p
Actual pupil personnel	M	4.80	18.00	5		
	F	4.00	16.67	3	-.45	.65
Desired pupil personnel	M	4.30	19.40	5		
	F	4.83	19.00	3	-.30	.76
Actual staff personnel	M	3.75	41.75	4		
	F	4.33	45.33	3	-.35	.72
Desired staff personnel	M	3.00	46.67	3		
	F	4.00	58.00	3	-.65	.51
Actual school/community	M	5.20	26.00	5		
	F	3.33	24.33	3	-1.04	.30
Desired school/community	M	3.60	27.80	5		
	F	5.00	31.50	2	-.78	.43
Actual parental involvement	M	4.00	12.00	5		
	F	5.33	15.67	3	-.75	.46

Appendix E (continued)

Organizational area	Gender	rank	Mean	Cases	z	2-tailed p
Desired parental involvement	M	3.40	12.60	5		
	F	6.33	19.67	3	-1.64	.10
Actual staff development	M	4.20	12.00	5		
	F	5.00	15.33	3	-.48	.63
Desired staff development	M	3.40	12.60	5		
	F	6.33	18.00	3	-1.68	.09
Actual budget	M	3.90	45.20	5		
	F	4.25	47.50	2	-.20	.85
Desired budget	M	3.80	47.20	5		
	F	4.50	49.00	2	-.39	.70
Actual plant management	M	4.40	39.80	5		
	F	4.67	40.00	3	-.15	.88
Desired plant management	M	3.60	39.80	5		
	F	6.00	45.67	3	-1.34	.18

* ≤ .05.

APPENDIX F

KRUSKAL-WALLIS ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE RESULTS SHOWING DIFFERENCES IN ACTUAL AND DESIRED LEVELS OF PARTICIPATION FOR GROUPS BY AGE (AREAS WITHOUT SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCES)

Appendix F

Kruskal-Wallis Analysis of Variance Results Showing Differences in Actual and Desired Levels of Participation for Groups by Age
(Areas without Significant Differences)

Organizational area	Mean	Standard deviation	Cases	X^2	Probability
			Overall Summary		
Actual planning	48.66	10.61	212	9.79	.08
Desired planning	57.19	9.25	204	2.29	.68
Actual policy	39.55	11.54	215	7.00	.22
Desired policy	50.58	10.31	202	8.68	.12
Actual curriculum/instruction	36.40	10.92	213	9.55	.09
Desired curriculum/instruction	43.84	9.73	208	4.58	.47
Actual pupil personnel	26.12	7.45	217	10.91	.053
Desired pupil personnel	29.75	7.57	214	12.78*	.02
Actual staff personnel	52.50	13.71	192	4.78	.44
Desired staff personnel	62.13	13.03	181	3.09	.69
Actual school/community	27.60	8.05	210	6.38	.27
Desired school/community	30.78	7.51	203	6.95	.23

Appendix F (continued)

Organizational area	Mean	Standard deviation	Cases	X^2	Probability
			Overall Summary		
Actual parental involvement	19.85	6.48	214	5.33	.38
Desired parental involvement	21.37	6.56	207	2.38	.79
Actual staff development	21.14	5.93	215	6.26	.28
Desired staff development	22.86	5.35	212	1.87	.87
Actual budget	41.32	13.76	206	11.86*	.04
Desired budget	48.89	12.61	198	3.30	.65
Actual plant management	27.93	11.04	212	11.72*	.04
Desired plant management	35.97	10.61	208	9.23	.10

Appendix F (continued)

Organizational area	Age group	Mean	Mean rank	S.D.	n	X^2	p
		Principals					
Actual planning	Missing	45.67		11.64	18		
	20-29	43.00	28.00	0.00	1		
	30-39	47.33	52.60	8.81	15		
	40-49	49.67	60.41	10.06	64		
	50-59	51.31	67.53	9.79	35		
	60-69	54.00	78.11	5.83	9		
	(Overall)	49.55		9.93	142	4.67	.32
Desired planning	Missing	57.38		9.23	16		
	30-39	59.25	60.17	8.73	12		
	40.49	59.72	61.16	7.66	64		
	50-59	58.70	54.62	7.04	33		
	60-69	60.56	64.72	7.55	9		
	(Overall)	59.20		7.73	134	1.04	.79

Appendix F (continued)

Organizational area	Age group	Mean	Mean rank	S.D.	n	X^2	p
Actual policy	Missing	36.56		11.38	18		
	20-29	27.00	13.50	0.00	1		
	30-39	36.75	52.44	10.80	16		
	40-49	39.41	61.10	9.92	64		
	50-59	43.89	73.73	11.69	35		
	60-69	39.78	59.06	12.08	9		
	(Overall)	39.78		10.96	143	6.59	.16
Desired policy	Missing	52.63		8.80	16		
	20-29	56.00	69.00	0.00	1		
	30-39	55.79	71.57	8.84	14		
	40-49	51.34	49.31	7.54	62		
	50-59	54.94	65.37	7.22	31		
	60-69	57.75	78.88	6.50	8		
	(Overall)	53.23		7.86	132	11.09	.03*

Appendix F (continued)

Organizational area	Age group	Mean	Mean rank	S.D.	n	X^2	p
Actual curriculum/instruction	Missing	35.00		10.12	18		
	20-29	18.00	4.00	0.00	1		
	30-39	31.53	44.53	10.16	15		
	40-49	37.06	62.41	11.14	64		
	50-59	39.88	71.35	9.49	34		
	60-69	36.44	59.28	6.09	9		
	(Overall)	36.78		10.49	141	8.66	.07
Desired curriculum/instruction	Missing	44.71		9.32	17		
	20-29	43.00	47.50	0.00	1		
	30-39	45.93	62.07	8.95	15		
	40-49	44.92	59.08	8.24	65		
	50-59	46.45	64.85	8.74	31		
	60-69	45.89	61.28	8.49	9		
	(Overall)	45.40		8.46	138	.73	.95

Appendix F (continued)

Organizational area	Age group	Mean	Mean rank	S.D.	n	X^2	p
Actual pupil personnel	Missing	27.94		6.02	17		
	20-29	21.00	11.00	0.00	1		
	30-39	29.53	69.37	3.87	15		
	40-49	27.62	54.89	6.05	66		
	50-59	31.46	78.80	5.25	35		
	60-69	28.44	63.22	9.86	9		
	(Overall)	28.80		6.11	143	12.31	.02*
Desired pupil personnel	Missing	32.94		5.41	18		
	20-29	33.00	59.50	0.00	1		
	30-39	33.50	64.14	5.03	14		
	40-49	31.89	54.76	5.07	66		
	50-59	34.42	71.68	4.72	33		
	60-69	34.33	76.56	7.91	9		
	(Overall)	32.94		5.26	141	6.74	.15

Appendix F (continued)

Organizational area	Age group	Mean	Mean rank	S.D.	n	X^2	p
Actual staff personnel	Missing	51.19		11.37	16		
	20-29	36.00	6.50	0.00	1		
	30-39	51.47	46.90	12.57	15		
	40-49	55.51	54.74	12.66	55		
	50-59	59.85	63.68	11.95	33		
	60-69	59.00	63.25	7.11	8		
	(Overall)	55.68		12.35	128	5.81	.21
Desired staff personnel	Missing	66.27		10.46	15		
	20-29	51.00	11.00	0.00	1		
	30-39	61.46	40.77	11.89	13		
	40-49	65.42	50.85	10.14	55		
	50-59	68.63	59.75	9.46	30		
	60-69	69.60	65.90	17.52	5		
	(Overall)	65.96		10.46	119	6.75	.15

Appendix F (continued)

Organizational area	Age group	Mean	Mean rank	S.D.	n	X^2	p
Actual school community	Missing	27.41		7.13	17		
	20-29	17.00	4.00	0.00	1		
	30-39	31.50	68.68	7.72	14		
	40-49	29.44	58.50	7.32	66		
	50-59	30.97	66.11	6.57	32		
	60-69	30.33	62.33	5.55	9		
	(Overall)	29.72		7.13	139	4.26	.37
Desired school community	Missing	32.63		7.11	16		
	20-29	28.00	26.00	0.00	1		
	30-39	34.79	67.43	6.60	14		
	40-49	32.89	56.72	6.10	64		
	50-59	33.53	59.27	5.46	30		
	60-69	34.50	65.63	6.82	8		
	(Overall)	33.26		6.12	133	2.42	.66

Appendix F (continued)

Organizational area	Age group	Mean	Mean rank	S.D.	n	X^2	p
Actual parental involvement	Missing	23.35		4.51	17		
	20-29	15.00	59.00	0.00	1		
	30-39	22.86	126.64	5.07	14		
	40-49	22.13	94.04	5.56	64		
	50-59	23.57	98.45	5.42	35		
	60-69	22.33	109.75	3.46	9		
	(Overall)	22.67		5.24	140	5.33	.38
Desired parental involvement	Missing	25.41		4.39	17		
	20-29	21.00	85.50	0.00	1		
	30-39	23.00	110.69	5.31	13		
	40-49	24.35	96.08	4.68	63		
	50-59	24.67	93.51	4.58	33		
	60-69	22.50	94.92	6.72	8		
	(Overall)	24.30		4.79	135	2.38	.79

Appendix F (continued)

Organizational area	Age group	Mean	Mean rank	S.D.	n	X^2	p
Actual staff development	Missing	22.72		4.52	18		
	20-29	20.00	45.00	0.00	1		
	30-39	22.83	69.38	6.28	16		
	40-49	20.68	55.23	5.87	65		
	50-59	22.69	67.96	4.54	35		
	60-69	26.25	93.94	3.01	8		
	(Overall)	21.92		5.44	143	10.32	.04*
Desired staff development	Missing	25.50		3.75	18		
	20-29	23.00	51.00	0.00	1		
	30-39	24.40	64.90	4.50	15		
	40-49	23.08	54.73	4.60	63		
	50-59	25.11	71.01	3.51	34		
	60-69	24.11	68.44	6.45	9		
	(Overall)	24.09		4.41	140	5.41	.25

Appendix F (continued)

Organizational area	Age group	Mean	Mean rank	S.D.	n	X^2	p
Actual budget	Missing	40.67		13.16	18		
	20-29	58.00	104.00	0.00	1		
	30-39	39.19	49.88	14.21	16		
	40-49	44.78	65.10	12.62	60		
	50-59	41.68	57.56	12.74	34		
	60-69	42.00	55.00	10.26	9		
	(Overall)	42.75		12.78	138	4.58	.33
Desired budget	Missing	51.12		10.71	17		
	20-29	40.00	17.50	0.00	1		
	30-39	45.79	37.68	10.63	14		
	40-49	53.68	62.78	9.02	60		
	50-59	53.03	59.59	10.02	33		
	60-69	55.67	69.44	14.01	9		
	(Overall)	52.40		10.22	134	8.66	.07

Appendix F (continued)

Organizational area	Age group	Mean	Mean rank	S.D.	n	X^2	p
Actual plant management	Missing	31.61		8.87	18		
	20-29	34.00	87.00	0.00	1		
	30-39	26.56	54.00	9.56	16		
	40-49	28.16	60.35	10.67	62		
	50-59	28.35	61.47	8.08	34		
	60-69	33.33	80.00	8.69	9		
	(Overall)	28.84		9.62	140	3.77	.44
Desired plant management	Missing	40.12		6.76	17		
	20-29	28.00	11.50	0.00	1		
	30-39	35.63	51.63	10.34	16		
	40-49	38.66	60.26	7.06	62		
	50-59	39.15	62.86	7.21	33		
	60-69	44.11	81.44	10.67	9		
	(Overall)	38.88		7.89	138	6.33	.18

Appendix F (continued)

Organizational area	Age group	Mean	Mean rank	S.D.	n	X^2	p
		Central Office Personnel					
Actual planning	Missing	65.00		0.00	1		
	40-49	45.00	28.65	11.12	34		
	50-59	47.28	33.86	13.10	22		
	60-69	47.75	33.00	9.36	4		
	Over 70	58.00	51.00	0.00	2		
	(Overall)	46.68		11.81	63	3.60	.31
Desired planning	Missing	65.00		0.00	1		
	40-49	52.75	29.86	9.52	32		
	50-59	52.45	30.82	12.68	22		
	60-69	54.40	32.30	9.26	5		
	Over 70	61.00	48.00	0.00	2		
	(Overall)	53.24		10.57	62	2.00	.57

Appendix F (continued)

Organizational area	Age group	Mean	Mean rank	S.D.	n	X^2	p
Actual policy	40-49	37.88	31.09	12.47	34		
	50-59	41.13	37.27	14.25	24		
	60-69	40.80	35.30	10.87	5		
	Over 70	24.00	8.50	0.00	2		
	(Overall)	38.88		13.05	65	5.01	.17
Desired policy	40-49	46.72	33.83	11.88	32		
	50-59	44.42	31.38	13.57	24		
	60-69	47.40	34.30	10.04	5		
	Over 70	25.00	4.50	0.00	2		
	(Overall)	45.21		12.66	63	4.94	.18

Appendix F (continued)

Organizational area	Age group	Mean	Mean rank	S.D.	n	X^2	p
Actual curriculum/instruction	Missing	50.00		0.00	1		
	40-49	37.39	34.53	12.38	33		
	50-59	35.87	31.67	10.22	23		
	60-69	31.60	25.40	10.14	5		
	Over 70	23.00	10.50	0.00	2		
	(Overall)	36.14		11.48	64	4.04	.26
Desired curriculum/instruction	40-49	43.13	35.31	8.89	32		
	50-59	39.87	29.89	13.52	23		
	60-69	36.60	24.50	10.71	5		
	Over 70	26.00	6.50	0.00	2		
	(Overall)	40.84		11.20	62	6.21	.10

Appendix F (continued)

Organizational area	Age group	Mean	Mean rank	S.D.	n	X^2	p
Actual pupil personnel	Missing	21.00		0.00	1		
	40-49	22.79	37.01	7.61	34		
	50-59	18.92	27.23	5.30	24		
	60-69	26.80	44.00	8.17	5		
	Over 70	12.00	6.50	0.00	2		
	(Overall)	21.33		7.20	66	9.46	.02*
Desired pupil personnel	Missing	21.00		0.00	1		
	40-49	25.93	36.62	7.56	33		
	50-59	21.50	26.23	6.98	24		
	60-69	29.40	45.40	6.88	5		
	Over 70	14.00	7.50	0.00	2		
	(Overall)	24.12		7.67	65	10.38	.02*

Appendix F (continued)

Organizational area	Age group	Mean	Mean rank	S.D.	n	X^2	p
Actual staff personnel	40-49	46.66	29.05	12.76	29		
	50-59	43.36	25.64	16.08	22		
	60-69	54.75	36.88	17.46	4		
	Over 70	62.00	49.50	0.00	2		
	(Overall)	46.49		14.56	57	4.86	.18
Desired staff personnel	40-49	57.21	29.91	10.65	29		
	50-59	49.52	23.48	16.47	21		
	60-69	60.00	34.63	20.67	4		
	Over 70	72.00	48.50	0.00	2		
	(Overall)	55.05		14.35	56	5.79	.12

Appendix F (continued)

Organizational area	Age group	Mean	Mean rank	S.D.	n	X^2	p
Actual school/community	40-49	22.50	30.28	7.65	32		
	50-59	22.88	32.04	9.03	24		
	60-69	25.40	34.40	11.30	5		
	Over 70	33.00	53.00	0.00	2		
	(Overall)	23.21		8.46	62	3.00	.39
Desired school/community	40-49	25.56	30.81	7.70	32		
	50-59	24.54	30.90	7.37	24		
	60-69	28.20	34.50	10.57	5		
	Over 70	37.00	58.00	0.00	2		
	(Overall)	25.75		7.89	63	4.36	.23

Appendix F (continued)

Organizational area	Age group	Mean	Mean rank	S.D.	n	X^2	p
Actual parental involvement	Missing	13.00		0.00	1		
	40-49	14.26	31.88	4.83	34		
	50-59	14.04	32.31	4.40	24		
	60-69	18.20	35.50	9.99	5		
	Over 70	18.00	54.00	0.00	2		
	(Overall)	14.58		5.14	66	2.73	.44
Desired parental involvement	40-49	16.06	32.24	5.87	33		
	50-59	15.21	31.56	5.42	24		
	60-69	18.40	34.10	8.79	5		
	Over 70	17.00	44.00	0.00	2		
	(Overall)	15.95		5.82	64	.88	.83

Appendix F (continued)

Organizational area	Age group	Mean	Mean rank	S.D.	n	X^2	p
Actual staff development	Missing	25.00		0.00	1		
	40-49	21.19	33.78	4.73	32		
	50-59	18.96	28.38	6.98	24		
	60-69	18.60	29.80	9.71	5		
	Over 70	27.00	52.50	0.00	2		
	(Overall)	20.39		6.15	64	3.84	.28
Desired staff development	Missing	25.00		0.00	1		
	40-49	22.61	36.18	4.35	33		
	50-59	19.04	24.93	6.42	23		
	60-69	19.20	29.10	9.71	5		
	Over 70	26.00	51.50	0.00	2		
	(Overall)	21.20		5.83	64	7.57	.06

Appendix F (continued)

Organizational area	Age group	Mean	Mean rank	S.D.	n	X^2	p
Actual budget	Missing	12.00		0.00	1		
	40-49	39.55	33.15	13.24	33		
	50-59	32.90	24.50	14.39	20		
	60-69	36.60	26.00	23.95	5		
	Over 70	67.00	58.00	0.00	2		
	(Overall)	37.57		15.70	61	8.42	.04*
Desired budget	Missing	12.00		0.00	1		
	40-49	42.74	30.60	11.40	31		
	50-59	39.10	25.95	15.76	20		
	60-69	41.00	25.70	22.67	5		
	(Overall)	40.77		14.44	57	1.15	.56

Appendix F (continued)

Organizational area	Age group	Mean	Mean rank	S.D.	n	X^2	p
Actual plant management	Missing	9.00		0.00	1		
	40-49	22.75	30.28	10.42	32		
	50-59	24.96	32.73	12.47	24		
	60-69	24.20	27.70	18.16	5		
	Over 70	54.00	61.50	0.00	2		
	(Overall)	24.45		12.81	64	5.79	.12
Desired plant management	Missing	9.00		0.00	1		
	40-49	27.94	29.77	10.65	31		
	50-59	28.17	30.28	12.51	23		
	60-69	29.80	30.70	16.19	5		
	Over 70	54.00	59.00	0.00	2		
	(Overall)	28.71		12.54	62	5.17	.16

Appendix F (continued)

Organizational area	Age group	Mean	Mean rank	S.D.	n	X^2	p
	School Board Chairpersons						
Actual planning	40-49	35.75	2.50	2.36	4		
	50-59	55.00	5.00	0.00	1		
	Over 70	62.50	6.50	4.95	2		
	(Overall)	48.43		11.41	7	4.91	.09
Desired planning	40-49	47.00	3.00	8.00	5		
	50-59	72.00	8.00	0.00	1		
	Over 70	63.00	6.50	4.24	2		
	(Overall)	54.13		11.98	8	5.25	.07
Actual policy	40-49	37.25	3.38	3.40	4		
	50-59	33.00	1.50	0.00	1		
	Over 70	53.50	6.50	0.71	2		
	(Overall)	41.29		8.83	7	4.51	.10

Appendix F (continued)

Organizational area	Age group	Mean	Mean rank	S.D.	n	X^2	p
Desired policy	40-49	45.75	3.25	10.05	4		
	50-59	45.00	3.00	0.00	1		
	Over 70	57.50	6.00	7.78	2		
	(Overall)	49.00		9.71	7	2.41	.30
Actual curriculum/instruction	40-49	33.80	4.90	14.99	5		
	50-59	20.00	2.50	0.00	1		
	Over 70	33.00	4.50	18.38	2		
	(Overall)	31.88		14.14	8	.82	.66
Desired curriculum/instruction	40-49	44.00	5.20	7.31	5		
	50-59	35.00	2.00	0.00	1		
	Over 70	33.00	4.00	26.87	2		
	(Overall)	40.13		12.76	8	1.53	.46

Appendix F (continued)

Organizational area	Age group	Mean	Mean rank	S.D.	n	X^2	p
Actual pupil personnel	40-49	16.60	4.40	3.85	5		
	50-59	14.00	2.00	0.00	1		
	Over 70	22.00	6.00	8.49	2		
	(Overall)	17.63		5.18	8	1.80	.41
Desired pupil personnel	40-49	18.00	4.10	2.92	5		
	50-59	21.00	6.00	0.00	1		
	Over 70	21.50	4.75	10.61	2		
	(Overall)	19.25		4.89	8	0.54	.77
Actual staff personnel	40-49	36.00	2.50	4.97	4		
	50-59	56.00	6.00	0.00	1		
	Over 70	51.50	6.00	12.02	2		
	(Overall)	43.29		11.01	7	4.50	.11

Appendix F (continued)

Organizational area	Age group	Mean	Mean rank	S.D.	n	X^2	p
Desired staff personnel	40-49	47.75	2.50	12.20	4		
	50-59	61.00	5.00	0.00	1		
	Over 70	62.00	6.00	0.00	1		
	(Overall)	52.33		11.83	6	3.57	.17
Actual school/community	40-49	23.60	3.60	6.43	5		
	50-59	26.00	5.00	0.00	1		
	Over 70	29.50	6.50	0.71	2		
	(Overall)	25.38		5.55	8	2.05	.36
Desired school/community	40-49	26.50	3.00	5.20	4		
	50-59	34.00	7.00	0.00	1		
	Over 70	31.00	4.50	0.00	2		
	(Overall)	28.86		4.81	7	2.95	.23

Appendix F (continued)

Organizational area	Age group	Mean	Mean rank	S.D.	n	X^2	p
Actual parental involvement	40-49	11.80	3.40	4.87	5		
	50-59	15.00	5.00	0.00	1		
	Over 70	18.50	7.00	3.54	2		
	(Overall)	13.88		4.97	8	3.13	.21
Desired parental involvement	40-49	12.20	3.40	6.30	5		
	50-59	24.00	8.00	0.00	1		
	Over 70	18.50	5.50	3.54	2		
	(Overall)	15.25		6.71	8	3.38	.18
Actual staff development	40-49	12.80	4.40	7.53	5		
	50-59	10.00	3.50	0.00	1		
	Over 70	16.00	5.25	8.49	2		
	(Overall)	13.25		6.82	8	.41	.81

Appendix F (continued)

Organizational area	Age group	Mean	Mean rank	S.D.	n	X^2	p
Desired staff development	40-49	14.00	4.20	6.82	5		
	50-59	15.00	6.00	0.00	1		
	Over 70	16.00	4.50	8.49	2		
	(Overall)	14.63		6.14	8	.47	.79
Actual budget	40-49	39.75	2.50	2.06	4		
	50-59	55.00	6.00	0.00	1		
	Over 70	53.50	8.00	4.95	2		
	(Overall)	45.86		8.03	7	4.58	.10
Desired budget	40-49	42.25	2.50	4.11	4		
	50-59	55.00	6.00	0.00	1		
	Over 70	55.00	6.00	2.83	2		
	(Overall)	47.71		7.50	7	4.50	.11

Appendix F (continued)

Organizational area	Age group	Mean	Mean rank	S.D.	n	X^2	p
Actual plant management	40-49	38.00	4.00	6.89	5		
	50-59	33.00	2.00	0.00	1		
	Over 70	48.00	7.00	8.49	2		
	(Overall)	39.88		8.10	8	3.33	.19
Desired plant management	40-49	39.60	3.60	8.08	5		
	50-59	44.00	6.00	0.00	1		
	Over 70	47.00	6.00	9.90	2		
	(Overall)	42.00		7.95	8	1.80	.41

* $\leq$ .05.

APPENDIX G

KRUSKAL-WALLIS ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE RESULTS SHOWING DIFFERENCES IN ACTUAL AND DESIRED LEVELS OF PARTICIPATION FOR GROUPS BY EDUCATIONAL LEVEL (AREAS WITHOUT SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCES)

Appendix G

Kruskal-Wallis Analysis of Variance Results Showing Differences in Actual and Desired Levels of Participation for Groups by Educational Level
(Areas without Significant Differences)

Category	Mean	Standard deviation	Cases	X^2	Signif.
			Overall Summary		
Actual planning	48.58	10.57	211	6.20	.29
Desired planning	57.15	9.25	203	6.50	.26
Actual policy	39.50	11.53	214	2.65	.75
Desired policy	50.58	10.34	201	1.63	.90
Actual curriculum/instruction	36.54	10.89	212	3.61	.61
Desired curriculum/instruction	43.98	9.53	207	2.07	.84
Actual pupil personnel	26.17	7.43	217	6.57	.26
Desired pupil personnel	29.83	7.51	213	8.67	.12
Actual staff personnel	52.55	13.73	191	4.76	.45
Desired staff personnel	62.13	13.03	181	4.96	.42
Actual school/community	27.59	8.07	209	5.30	.38

Appendix G (continued)

Category	Mean	Standard deviation	Cases	X^2	Signif.
Desired school/community	30.78	7.53	202	12.35	.03*
Actual parental involvement	19.84	6.50	213	10.36	.06
Desired parental involvement	21.37	6.57	206	17.01	.00*
Actual staff development	21.20	5.90	214	8.91	.11
Desired staff development	22.92	5.29	211	11.16	.05*
Actual budget	41.28	13.78	205	4.41	.49
Desired budget	48.87	12.64	197	2.61	.76
Actual plant management	27.81	10.91	211	8.59	.13
Desired plant management	35.89	10.56	207	7.00	.22

* $p \leq .05$.

Appendix G (continued)

Category	Education	Mean	Mean rank	S.D.	n	X^2	p
		Principals					
Actual planning	BS	41.00	48.50	18.38	2		
	MA	47.69	62.63	9.24	51		
	MA+45	49.73	3.27	10.00	60		
	EDS	51.95	82.00	9.48	20		
	EDD	53.38	85.50	9.90	8		
	Other	72.00	142.00	0.00	1		
	(Overall)	49.55		9.95	142	8.29	.14
Desired planning	BS	51.00	48.00	18.38	2		
	MA	58.74	65.63	8.27	47		
	MA+45	58.48	62.13	7.13	56		
	EDS	60.65	76.60	7.01	20		
	EDD	63.75	90.06	5.31	8		
	Other	72.00	133.00	0.00	1		
	(Overall)	59.20		7.73	134	8.36	.14

Appendix G (continued)

Category	Education	Mean	Mean rank	S.D.	n	X^2	p
Actual policy	BS	44.50	76.50	26.16	2		
	MA	38.27	67.07	9.37	51		
	MA+45	40.57	74.42	11.80	61		
	EDS	40.20	74.47	11.79	20		
	EDD	41.00	77.06	9.77	9		
	(Overall)	39.78		10.96	143	1.16	.88
Desired policy	BS	48.50	61.25	23.33	2		
	MA	54.19	69.76	6.88	48		
	MA+45	52.57	62.88	7.75	54		
	EDS	52.84	67.39	9.13	19		
	EDD	54.00	70.11	7.98	9		
	(Overall)	53.23		7.86	132	.96	.92

Appendix G (continued)

Category	Education	Mean	Mean rank	S.D.	n	X^2	p
Actual curriculum/instruction	BS	34.50	70.15	34.65	2		
	MA	36.17	68.16	9.19	52		
	MA+45	37.29	72.85	10.11	58		
	EDS	35.60	67.55	12.45	20		
	EDD	40.11	83.22	10.90	9		
	(Overall)	36.78		10.49	141	1.32	.86
Desired curriculum/instruction	BS	46.00	71.25	18.38	2		
	MA	45.65	69.75	7.79	51		
	MA+45	44.95	67.30	8.96	57		
	EDS	45.11	70.08	8.76	19		
	EDD	47.33	80.39	7.92	9		
	(Overall)	45.40		8.46	138	.85	.93

Appendix G (continued)

Category	Education	Mean	Mean rank	S.D.	n	X^2	p
Actual pupil personnel	BS	31.00	75.25	15.56	2		
	MA	28.45	70.29	6.43	51		
	MA+45	29.10	74.33	5.84	61		
	EDS	27.60	62.28	5.61	20		
	EDD	31.00	86.78	5.68	9		
	(Overall)	28.80		6.11	143	2.55	.64
Desired pupil personnel	BS	35.50	86.25	9.19	2		
	MA	33.02	70.89	5.11	51		
	MA+45	32.78	70.25	5.49	59		
	EDS	32.65	69.78	5.29	20		
	EDD	33.67	75.83	4.85	9		
	(Overall)	32.94		5.26	141	.44	.98

Appendix G (continued)

Category	Education	Mean	Mean rank	S.D.	n	X^2	p
Actual staff personnel	BS	45.50	57.50	36.06	2		
	MA	54.08	59.11	11.10	49		
	MA+45	55.57	63.92	11.47	53		
	EDS	61.31	80.78	12.27	16		
	EDD	57.50	70.50	17.70	8		
	(Overall)	55.68		12.35	128	4.41	.35
Desired staff personnel	BS	61.50	57.75	27.58	2		
	MA	63.43	51.08	10.29	46		
	MA+45	67.65	65.00	9.62	48		
	EDS	69.53	72.57	10.33	15		
	EDD	64.75	58.31	13.84	8		
	(Overall)	65.96		10.65	119	6.11	.19

Appendix G (continued)

Category	Education	Mean	Mean rank	S.D.	n	X^2	p
Actual school/community	BS	29.50	70.75	17.68	2		
	MA	29.60	69.27	7.62	48		
	MA+45	29.53	69.15	6.50	59		
	EDS	29.90	70.78	7.44	20		
	EDD	30.44	72.50	7.16	9		
	Other	37.00	115.50	0.00	1		
	(Overall)	29.72		7.13	139	1.36	.93
Desired school/community	BS	31.50	64.25	14.85	2		
	MA	34.19	72.98	6.55	48		
	MA+45	32.77	63.59	5.63	53		
	EDS	32.30	61.00	5.86	20		
	EDD	33.33	66.06	6.25	9		
	Other	37.00	94.50	0.00	1		
	(Overall)	33.26		6.12	133	2.59	.76

Appendix G (continued)

Category	Education	Mean	Mean rank	S.D.	n	X^2	p
Actual parental involvement	BS	24.00	81.50	8.49	2		
	MA	22.53	70.47	5.30	49		
	MA+45	23.08	72.22	4.62	59		
	EDS	20.95	62.08	7.01	20		
	EDD	24.33	77.83	4.00	9		
	Other	22.00	51.00	0.00	1		
	(Overall)	22.67		5.24	140	1.65	.89
Desired parental involvement	BS	23.00	67.25	9.90	2		
	MA	24.52	70.43	5.02	48		
	MA+45	24.60	69.25	4.23	57		
	EDS	23.44	62.58	5.52	18		
	EDD	23.44	61.28	5.41	9		
	Other	22.00	39.50	0.00	1		
	(Overall)	24.30		4.79	135	1.40	.92

Appendix G (continued)

Category	Education	Mean	Mean rank	S.D.	n	X^2	p
Actual staff development	BS	17.50	68.25	17.68	2		
	MA	22.02	72.00	5.32	52		
	MA+45	22.49	77.29	5.54	59		
	EDS	20.70	60.92	5.12	20		
	EDD	21.56	65.28	3.09	9		
	Other	20.00	49.50	0.00	1		
	(Overall)	21.92		5.44	143	2.97	.71
Desired staff development	BS	24.00	70.25	8.49	2		
	MA	24.28	72.01	4.55	50		
	MA+45	24.60	76.15	4.39	57		
	EDS	23.00	60.17	4.46	21		
	EDD	22.89	55.28	3.10	9		
	Other	20.00	27.50	0.00	1		
	(Overall)	24.09		4.42	140	5.00	.42

Appendix G (continued)

Category	Education	Mean	Mean rank	S.D.	n	X^2	p
Actual budget	BS	44.00	71.25	21.21	2		
	MA	43.04	71.23	13.21	49		
	MA+45	41.96	66.32	11.50	57		
	EDS	43.05	70.32	13.90	20		
	EDD	41.89	70.33	13.96	9		
	Other	72.00	138.00	0.00	1		
	(Overall)	42.75		12.78	138	3.41	.64
Desired budget	BS	46.50	61.75	27.58	2		
	MA	51.04	62.75	10.56	46		
	MA+45	53.77	72.04	9.41	56		
	EDS	50.85	61.92	8.93	20		
	EDD	53.44	70.00	11.34	9		
	Other	72.00	132.00	0.00	1		
	(Overall)	52.40		10.22	134	4.72	.45

Appendix G (continued)

Category	Education	Mean	Mean rank	S.D.	n	X^2	p
Actual plant management	BS	35.00	75.00	26.87	2		
	MA	30.52	77.74	9.24	52		
	MA+45	27.65	66.46	8.63	57		
	EDS	29.53	71.66	11.56	19		
	EDD	23.11	46.89	8.30	9		
	Other	36.00	106.00	0.00	1		
	(Overall)	28.84		9.62	140	6.09	.30
Desired plant management	BS	36.50	67.25	24.75	2		
	MA	38.92	69.91	8.00	52		
	MA+45	39.35	71.45	7.83	55		
	EDS	39.37	71.84	6.64	19		
	EDD	35.67	52.78	7.16	9		
	Other	36.00	51.00	0.00	1		
	(Overall)	38.88		7.89	138	2.00	.85

Appendix G (continued)

Category	Education	Mean	Mean rank	S.D.	n	X^2	p
	Central Office Personnel						
Actual planning	MA	47.13	33.66	14.64	16		
	MA+45	45.04	28.77	11.27	24		
	EDS	53.00	43.67	5.57	3		
	EDD	47.47	33.08	11.17	19		
	Other	45.00	27.50	0.00	1		
	(Overall)	46.68		11.81	63	2.22	.70
Desired planning	MA	54.94	33.84	8.77	16		
	MA+45	51.80	30.54	13.28	25		
	EDS	54.67	34.17	5.03	3		
	EDD	53.94	31.32	8.71	17		
	Other	46.00	13.00	0.00	1		
	(Overall)	53.24		10.57	62	1.46	.83

Appendix G (continued)

Category	Education	Mean	Mean rank	S.D.	n	X^2	p
Actual policy	MA	35.47	28.30	14.10	15		
	MA+45	37.58	31.15	13.46	26		
	EDS	46.50	46.13	7.59	4		
	EDD	41.53	35.97	12.48	19		
	Other	43.00	42.50	0.00	1		
	(Overall)	38.88		13.05	65	3.83	.43
Desired policy	MA	43.67	29.33	11.53	15		
	MA+45	43.58	29.77	14.84	26		
	EDS	47.75	36.63	5.50	4		
	EDD	48.41	36.59	11.67	17		
	Other	46.00	33.50	0.00	1		
	(Overall)	45.21		12.66	63	2.03	.73

Appendix G (continued)

Category	Education	Mean	Mean rank	S.D.	n	X^2	p
Actual curriculum/instruction	MA	34.56	30.09	12.91	16		
	MA+45	34.92	30.08	12.90	24		
	EDS	37.25	34.88	10.21	4		
	EDD	37.63	35.50	7.68	19		
	Other	58.00	62.50	0.00	1		
	(Overall)	36.14		11.48	64	3.83	.43
Desired curriculum/instruction	MA	42.53	34.03	11.34	15		
	MA+45	39.52	28.91	13.60	23		
	EDS	39.75	31.38	11.09	4		
	EDD	40.42	31.34	7.55	19		
	Other	58.00	56.50	0.00	1		
	(Overall)	40.84		11.20	62	2.69	.61

Appendix G (continued)

Category	Education	Mean	Mean rank	S.D.	n	X^2	p
Actual pupil personnel	MA	21.25	32.75	7.94	16		
	MA+45	20.81	33.15	6.74	26		
	EDS	22.50	37.75	3.51	4		
	EDD	21.53	32.55	8.14	19		
	Other	28.00	55.50	0.00	1		
	(Overall)	21.33		7.20	66	1.60	.81
Desired pupil personnel	MA	25.44	35.50	7.62	16		
	MA+45	22.80	29.82	8.08	25		
	EDS	24.00	32.25	3.16	4		
	EDD	24.58	34.53	8.19	19		
	Other	28.00	46.50	0.00	1		
	(Overall)	24.12		7.67	65	1.63	.80

Appendix G (continued)

Category	Education	Mean	Mean rank	S.D.	n	X^2	p
Actual staff personnel	MA	45.73	28.37	16.24	15		
	MA+45	45.96	28.19	16.06	24		
	EDS	44.25	26.25	13.20	4		
	EDD	48.38	30.96	11.43	13		
	Other	55.00	43.50	0.00	1		
	(Overall)	46.49		14.56	57	1.14	.89
Desired staff personnel	MA	57.93	31.50	10.34	14		
	MA+45	53.28	27.12	17.63	25		
	EDS	46.25	18.38	13.94	4		
	EDD	57.58	30.21	10.59	12		
	Other	64.00	41.00	0.00	1		
	(Overall)	55.05		14.35	56	2.92	.57

Appendix G (continued)

Category	Education	Mean	Mean rank	S.D.	n	X^2	p
Actual school/community	MA	22.87	31.33	8.53	15		
	MA+45	23.84	33.32	9.17	25		
	EDS	27.50	43.13	6.25	4		
	EDD	22.06	29.19	8.13	18		
	Other	16.00	15.00	0.00	1		
	(Overall)	23.21		8.46	63	2.91	.57
Desired school/community	MA	29.50	41.89	6.38	14		
	MA+45	24.68	29.58	8.67	25		
	EDS	28.25	39.38	5.44	4		
	EDD	24.37	27.68	7.64	19		
	Other	16.00	6.50	0.00	1		
	(Overall)	25.75		7.89	63	8.18	.09

Appendix G (continued)

Category	Education	Mean	Mean rank	S.D.	n	X^2	p
Actual parental involvement	MA	14.88	37.31	4.11	16		
	MA+45	14.23	31.10	5.46	26		
	EDS	17.75	50.00	4.27	4		
	EDD	14.16	30.03	5.82	19		
	Other	14.00	35.00	0.00	1		
	(Overall)	14.58		5.14	66	4.66	.32
Desired parental involvement	MA	17.86	41.54	4.82	14		
	MA+45	15.42	28.92	6.77	26		
	EDS	17.50	41.13	4.51	4		
	EDD	15.05	29.13	5.47	19		
	Other	14.00	28.50	0.00	1		
	(Overall)	15.95		5.82	64	5.85	.21

Appendix G (continued)

Category	Education	Mean	Mean rank	S.D.	n	X^2	p
Actual staff development	MA	21.31	35.81	7.05	16		
	MA+45	20.04	31.98	6.22	26		
	EDS	20.75	31.50	5.91	4		
	EDD	19.53	28.94	5.47	17		
	Other	28.00	57.50	0.00	1		
	(Overall)	20.39		6.15	64	2.98	.56
Desired staff development	MA	23.27	39.07	4.10	15		
	MA+45	19.96	29.02	6.41	25		
	EDS	20.00	27.00	6.63	4		
	EDD	21.11	31.82	5.94	19		
	Other	28.00	56.00	0.00	1		
	(Overall)	21.20		5.83	64	4.74	.32

Appendix G (continued)

Category	Education	Mean	Mean rank	S.D.	n	X^2	p
Actual budget	MA	37.20	29.43	19.87	15		
	MA+45	35.70	28.74	13.33	23		
	EDS	25.25	17.50	12.42	4		
	EDD	42.67	37.69	14.74	18		
	Other	44.00	40.00	0.00	1		
	(Overall)	37.57		15.70	61	5.63	.23
Desired budget	MA	39.25	28.17	14.38	12		
	MA+45	41.09	28.33	16.25	23		
	EDS	28.50	15.25	15.00	4		
	EDD	44.12	33.59	11.44	17		
	Other	44.00	31.50	0.00	1		
	(Overall)	40.77		14.44	57	4.14	.39

Appendix G (continued)

Category	Education	Mean	Mean rank	S.D.	n	X^2	p
Actual plant management	MA	26.25	34.41	14.95	16		
	MA+45	22.84	30.10	12.51	25		
	EDS	23.00	29.88	12.52	4		
	EDD	25.89	35.39	12.20	18		
	Other	16.00	20.50	0.00	1		
	(Overall)	24.45		12.81	64	1.51	.82
Desired plant management	MA	32.57	37.32	13.28	14		
	MA+45	27.12	28.76	13.65	25		
	EDS	24.00	24.00	12.71	4		
	EDD	29.56	33.42	10.46	18		
	Other	18.00	14.00	0.00	1		
	(Overall)	28.71		12.54	62	3.88	.42

Appendix G (continued)

Category	Education	Mean	Mean rank	S.D.	n	X^2	p
	School Board Chairpersons						
Actual planning	BS	39.00	2.25	1.41	2		
	Other	48.75	4.13	9.88	4		
	(Overall)	45.50		9.18	6	1.38	.24
Desired planning	BS	39.00	1.50	1.41	2		
	MA	57.00	5.00	0.00	1		
	Other	58.00	5.00	10.58	4		
	(Overall)	52.43		11.86	7	3.75	.15
Actual policy	BS	33.00	1.50	0.00	1		
	MA	40.00	4.50	0.00	1		
	Other	40.75	3.75	9.29	4		
	(Overall)	39.33		7.84	6	1.59	.45

Appendix G (continued)

Category	Education	Mean	Mean rank	S.D.	n	X^2	p
Desired policy	BS	33.00	1.00	0.00	1		
	MA	43.00	2.00	0.00	1		
	Other	53.75	4.50	7.63	4		
	(Overall)	48.50		10.54	6	3.57	.17
Actual curriculum/instruction	BS	49.50	6.25	4.95	2		
	MA	29.00	4.00	0.00	1		
	Other	26.75	2.88	12.89	4		
	(Overall)	33.57		14.36	7	3.31	.19
Desired curriculum/instruction	BS	49.50	5.50	4.95	2		
	MA	36.00	2.00	0.00	1		
	Other	43.00	3.75	8.29	4		
	(Overall)	43.86		7.73	7	1.88	.39

Appendix G (continued)

Category	Education	Mean	Mean rank	S.D.	n	X^2	p
Actual pupil personnel	BS	18.00	4.50	1.41	2		
	MA	21.00	6.00	0.00	1		
	Other	17.00	3.25	7.53	4		
	(Overall)	17.86		5.55	7	1.45	.49
Desired pupil personnel	BS	18.00	3.00	1.41	2		
	MA	14.00	1.00	0.00	1		
	Other	22.50	5.25	4.65	4		
	(Overall)	20.00		4.76	7	3.70	.16
Actual staff personnel	BS	31.00	1.00	0.00	1		
	MA	42.00	4.00	0.00	1		
	Other	46.75	4.00	13.25	4		
	(Overall)	43.33		12.06	6	2.14	.34

Appendix G (continued)

Category	Education	Mean	Mean rank	S.D.	n	X^2	p
Desired staff personnel	BS	31.00	1.00	0.00	1		
	MA	59.00	4.00	0.00	1		
	Other	56.00	4.00	6.98	4		
	(Overall)	52.33		11.83	6	2.14	.34
Actual school/community	BS	28.50	5.50	4.95	2		
	MA	24.00	3.00	0.00	1		
	Other	23.25	3.50	6.80	4		
	(Overall)	24.86		5.79	7	1.39	.50
Desired school/community	BS	28.50	3.50	4.95	2		
	Other	28.50	3.50	6.03	4		
	(Overall)	28.50		5.17	6	.00	1.00

Appendix G (continued)

Category	Education	Mean	Mean rank	S.D.	n	X^2	p
Actual parental involvement	BS	9.00	2.00	4.24	2		
	MA	19.00	7.00	0.00	1		
	Other	13.25	4.25	3.10	4		
	(Overall)	12.86		4.38	7	3.70	.16
Desired parental involvement	BS	8.50	2.00	4.95	2		
	MA	22.00	6.00	0.00	1		
	Other	15.50	4.50	6.35	4		
	(Overall)	14.43		6.80	7	2.79	.25
Actual staff development	BS	9.00	3.00	2.83	2		
	MA	26.00	7.00	0.00	1		
	Other	13.00	3.75	6.00	4		
	(Overall)	13.71		7.23	7	2.60	.27

Appendix G (continued)

Category	Education	Mean	Mean rank	S.D.	n	X^2	p
Desired staff development	BS	10.50	2.25	0.71	2		
	MA	26.00	7.00	0.00	1		
	Other	15.00	4.13	5.10	4		
	(Overall)	15.29		6.32	7	3.31	.19
Actual budget	BS	39.50	2.50	3.54	2		
	Other	48.00	4.00	9.27	4		
	(Overall)	45.17		8.57	6	.88	.35
Desired budget	BS	39.50	1.50	3.54	2		
	Other	50.50	4.50	6.61	4		
	(Overall)	46.83		7.81	6	3.43	.06

Appendix G (continued)

Category	Education	Mean	Mean rank	S.D.	n	X^2	p
Actual plant management	BS	33.00	2.00	4.24	2		
	MA	49.00	7.00	0.00	1		
	Other	37.50	4.25	3.70	4		
	(Overall)	37.86		6.20	7	3.70	.16
Desired plant management	BS	33.00	1.50	4.24	2		
	MA	52.00	7.00	0.00	1		
	Other	41.00	4.50	2.16	4		
	(Overall)	40.29		6.80	7	4.82	.09

* $p \leq .05$.

APPENDIX H

KRUSKAL-WALLIS ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE RESULTS SHOWING DIFFERENCES IN ACTUAL AND DESIRED LEVELS OF PARTICIPATION FOR GROUPS BY EXPERIENCE (AREAS WITHOUT SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCES)

Appendix H

Kruskal-Wallis Analysis of Variance Results Showing Differences in Actual and Desired Levels of Participation for Groups by Experience (Areas without Significant Differences)

Category	Mean	Standard deviation	Cases	X^2	Signif.
			Overall Summary		
Actual planning	48.54	10.62	209	8.40	.30
Desired planning	57.03	9.21	201	4.34	.74
Actual policy	39.59	11.57	212	8.95	.26
Desired policy	50.57	10.33	200	4.12	.77
Actual curriculum/instruction	36.43	10.91	210	16.97	.02*
Desired curriculum/instruction	43.78	9.72	205	11.20	.13
Actual pupil personnel	26.18	7.44	215	9.88	.20
Desired pupil personnel	29.72	7.54	211	10.17	.18
Actual staff personnel	52.56	13.74	190	9.22	.24
Desired staff personnel	62.13	13.10	179	7.37	.39
Actual school/community	27.66	8.06	207	3.24	.86

Appendix H (continued)

Category	Mean	Standard deviation	Cases	X^2	Signif.
Desired school/community	30.80	7.53	201	6.44	.49
Actual parental involvement	19.86	6.52	211	2.07	.96
Desired parental involvement	21.32	6.57	204	5.40	.61
Actual staff development	21.20	5.91	212	10.48	.16
Desired staff development	22.89	5.39	209	9.82	.20
Actual budget	41.22	13.83	203	3.83	.80
Desired budget	48.75	12.66	195	3.89	.79
Actual plant management	27.85	11.09	209	6.04	.54
Desired plant management	35.89	10.63	206	1.83	.97

* $\leq$ .05.

Appendix H (continued)

Category	Years of experience	Mean	Mean rank	S.D.	n	X^2	p
		Principals					
Actual planning	< 5	41.00	46.13	14.72	4		
	6-10	36.00	20.25	11.31	2		
	11-15	48.06	64.00	8.61	17		
	16-20	50.84	75.11	10.43	32		
	21-25	49.67	71.07	8.61	36		
	26-30	49.84	71.19	10.86	31		
	31-40	50.62	79.69	10.47	13		
	Over 40	49.80	70.40	6.53	5		
	(Overall)	49.43		9.94	140	6.06	.53
Desired planning	< 5	54.00	47.67	11.79	3		
	6-10	58.00	77.33	17.44	3		
	11-15	56.79	56.07	8.13	14		
	16-20	60.27	72.00	7.11	30		
	21-25	60.97	75.26	7.63	35		
	26-30	57.41	57.71	7.59	29		
	31-40	59.38	65.00	6.47	13		
	Over 40	58.40	61.10	6.19	5		
	(Overall)	59.11		7.75	132	6.13	.52

Appendix H (continued)

Category	Years of experience	Mean	Mean rank	S.D.	n	X^2	p
Actual policy	< 5	39.50	61.88	16.34	4		
	6-10	25.33	14.83	5.03	3		
	11-15	39.82	70.15	10.50	17		
	16-20	39.07	70.88	10.29	29		
	21-25	40.56	74.40	9.65	39		
	26-30	40.29	73.27	12.33	31		
	31-40	42.31	78.00	11.69	13		
	Over 40	36.80	56.80	13.59	5		
	(Overall)	39.78		10.97	141	7.24	.40
Desired policy	< 5	54.00	67.13	8.37	4		
	6-10	45.67	41.67	12.67	3		
	11-15	52.21	58.43	6.41	14		
	16-20	52.96	66.30	8.40	28		
	21-25	52.62	62.88	8.24	37		
	26-30	53.45	67.29	7.46	29		
	31-40	57.27	85.77	6.44	11		
	Over 40	54.60	71.30	8.08	5		
	(Overall)	53.18		7.87	131	5.17	.64

Appendix H (continued)

Category	Years of experience	Mean	Mean rank	S.D.	n	X^2	p
Actual curriculum/instruction	< 5	32.50	50.75	19.10	4		
	6-10	24.67	33.17	14.50	3		
	11-15	36.50	67.75	8.28	16		
	16-20	36.32	68.53	10.26	31		
	21-25	36.78	70.93	11.17	37		
	26-30	39.80	81.77	10.06	30		
	31-40	36.36	67.89	9.70	14		
	Over 40	31.50	47.75	1.29	4		
	(Overall)	36.71		10.52	139	7.37	.39
Desired curriculum/instruction	< 5	45.25	65.75	10.01	4		
	6-10	37.67	30.33	5.03	3		
	11-15	46.63	73.53	6.85	16		
	16-20	45.47	70.90	8.73	30		
	21-25	45.73	70.35	8.32	37		
	26-30	45.48	69.95	8.89	29		
	31-40	43.85	61.77	9.28	13		
	Over 40	43.00	56.00	10.86	4		
	(Overall)	45.27		8.44	136	4.12	.77

Appendix H (continued)

Category	Years of experience	Mean	Mean rank	S.D.	n	X^2	p
Actual pupil personnel	< 5	26.00	43.88	10.68	4		
	6-10	27.67	64.00	7.09	3		
	11-15	28.60	68.13	6.62	15		
	16-20	28.23	68.76	5.13	31		
	21-25	28.18	66.31	5.81	40		
	26-30	31.13	86.82	6.03	30		
	31-40	28.71	73.57	7.53	14		
	Over 40	28.00	69.00	5.20	5		
	(Overall)	28.83		6.13	142	7.01	.43
Desired pupil personnel	< 5	32.50	63.13	6.86	4		
	6-10	32.33	63.00	2.89	3		
	11-15	33.40	73.87	6.17	15		
	16-20	32.13	65.15	5.35	30		
	21-25	32.18	63.80	4.57	38		
	26-30	34.03	78.97	5.34	30		
	31-40	32.57	69.68	6.05	14		
	Over 40	35.60	91.41	4.45	5		
	(Overall)	32.88		5.24	139	4.60	.71

Appendix H (continued)

Category	Years of experience	Mean	Mean rank	S.D.	n	X^2	p
Actual staff personnel	< 5	46.00	37.00	16.95	4		
	6-10	42.33	36.17	19.50	3		
	11-15	55.80	63.23	10.67	15		
	16-20	54.63	61.26	13.41	27		
	21-25	56.97	68.28	11.83	32		
	26-30	57.59	66.67	12.32	29		
	31-40	58.25	71.50	10.28	12		
	Over 40	54.80	58.50	7.60	5		
	(Overall)	55.82		12.30	127	5.22	.63
Desired staff personnel	< 5	58.25	36.25	15.22	4		
	6-10	53.33	22.50	10.26	3		
	11-15	66.36	60.61	12.36	14		
	16-20	65.56	58.28	11.38	25		
	21-25	66.74	61.18	9.35	31		
	26-30	67.93	65.87	10.19	27		
	31-40	65.36	57.82	10.62	11		
	Over 40	67.67	64.00	6.03	3		
	(Overall)	65.98		10.69	118	6.50	.48

Appendix H (continued)

Category	Years of experience	Mean	Mean rank	S.D.	n	X^2	p
Actual school/community	< 5	26.00	47.50	11.05	4		
	6-10	31.00	79.00	12.29	3		
	11-15	29.29	66.64	8.57	14		
	16-20	31.16	76.66	6.19	31		
	21-25	28.79	62.51	7.22	39		
	26-30	30.33	71.78	7.12	30		
	31-40	30.00	69.64	5.81	11		
	Over 40	30.20	71.80	3.96	5		
	(Overall)	29.83		7.07	137	3.79	.80
Desired school/community	< 5	31.50	54.38	7.19	4		
	6-10	32.67	67.33	10.41	3		
	11-15	32.64	65.89	8.27	14		
	16-20	34.87	75.94	5.59	31		
	21-25	31.89	56.90	5.73	35		
	26-30	33.89	69.43	6.05	28		
	31-40	33.08	63.79	5.42	12		
	Over 40	35.00	76.20	3.94	5		
	(Overall)	33.33		6.10	132	5.07	.65

Appendix H (continued)

Category	Years of experience	Mean	Mean rank	S.D.	n	X^2	p
Actual parental involvement	< 5	19.25	44.75	7.18	4		
	6-10	23.67	81.17	4.93	3		
	11-15	22.20	63.97	5.45	15		
	16-20	23.42	74.34	4.67	31		
	21-25	22.17	67.04	6.03	36		
	26-30	22.51	68.34	5.58	31		
	31-40	24.38	80.38	3.55	13		
	Over 40	22.60	65.50	3.91	5		
	(Overall)	22.70		5.27	138	3.73	.81
Desired parental involvement	< 5	21.50	45.75	6.03	4		
	6-10	23.00	59.67	6.08	3		
	11-15	23.87	63.37	5.07	15		
	16-20	25.24	72.09	3.38	29		
	21-25	23.82	64.75	5.59	34		
	26-30	24.53	69.33	4.75	30		
	31-40	24.23	68.35	5.61	13		
	Over 40	25.00	67.60	1.58	5		
	(Overall)	24.29		4.78	133	2.22	.95

Appendix H (continued)

Category	Years of experience	Mean	Mean rank	S.D.	n	X^2	p
Actual staff development	< 5	20.50	57.50	6.61	4		
	6-10	18.67	68.83	11.85	3		
	11-15	22.56	75.34	5.39	16		
	16-20	21.35	65.37	5.70	39		
	21-25	21.23	65.67	5.29	39		
	26-30	22.97	78.12	5.20	30		
	31-40	22.31	73.00	5.04	13		
	Over 40	25.20	97.80	2.17	5		
	(Overall)	21.94		5.45	141	5.02	.66
Desired staff development	< 5	23.00	53.13	4.97	4		
	6-10	24.33	71.67	6.03	3		
	11-15	23.94	69.25	5.14	16		
	16-20	24.14	67.95	4.02	29		
	21-25	23.27	62.18	4.45	37		
	26-30	25.23	79.87	4.12	30		
	31-40	23.43	66.43	5.26	14		
	Over 40	26.20	89.30	2.17	5		
	(Overall)	24.09		4.42	138	5.14	.64

Appendix H (continued)

Category	Years of experience	Mean	Mean rank	S.D.	n	X^2	p
Actual budget	< 5	38.75	63.38	22.82	4		
	6-10	45.50	73.25	23.33	2		
	11-15	44.69	75.69	9.75	16		
	16-20	43.45	70.87	13.80	31		
	21-25	42.50	66.63	11.50	36		
	26-30	42.10	67.19	14.20	29		
	31-40	43.77	72.23	13.20	13		
	Over 40	36.40	44.40	9.56	5		
	(Overall)	42.72		12.87	136	2.84	.90
Desired budget	< 5	44.75	41.38	14.27	4		
	6-10	39.00	28.50	16.97	2		
	11-15	52.36	64.96	7.78	14		
	16-20	52.97	68.52	10.06	30		
	21-25	52.57	68.19	9.07	35		
	26-30	53.10	70.12	11.58	30		
	31-40	55.00	74.46	11.50	12		
	Over 40	46.40	41.40	6.39	5		
	(Overall)	52.30		10.27	132	6.83	.45

Appendix H (continued)

Category	Years of experience	Mean	Mean rank	S.D.	n	X^2	p
Actual plant management	< 5	31.75	71.38	16.46	4		
	6-10	22.67	44.50	15.14	3		
	11-15	30.00	74.26	9.02	17		
	16-20	29.27	72.57	9.60	30		
	21-25	25.97	57.38	9.33	36		
	26-30	29.67	73.60	10.08	30		
	31-40	31.77	82.08	8.62	13		
	Over 40	29.60	78.40	4.04	5		
	(Overall)	28.76		9.67	138	6.77	.45
Desired plant management	< 5	37.00	53.25	11.83	4		
	6-10	28.67	31.50	11.24	3		
	11-15	37.65	59.88	8.04	17		
	16-20	38.23	67.75	5.88	30		
	21-25	38.57	68.21	8.77	35		
	26-30	41.13	80.23	6.88	30		
	31-40	40.15	72.42	9.56	13		
	Over 40	39.00	71.80	6.28	5		
	(Overall)	38.85		7.90	137	6.79	.45

Appendix H (continued)

Category	Years of experience	Mean	Mean rank	S.D.	n	X^2	p
		Central Office Personnel					
Actual planning	6-10	38.00	15.00	0.00	1		
	11-15	36.00	13.00	5.57	3		
	16-20	34.63	15.31	11.45	8		
	21-25	49.00	35.53	10.17	9		
	26-30	50.13	36.75	11.42	16		
	31-40	49.00	36.00	11.32	14		
	Over 40	49.50	36.25	14.85	2		
	(Overall)	46.68		11.81	63	13.28	.04*
Desired planning	6-10	44.00	9.00	0.00	1		
	11-15	46.67	19.17	7.09	3		
	16-20	49.50	22.25	5.81	8		
	21-25	54.89	34.81	11.97	18		
	26-30	55.33	35.37	9.62	15		
	31-40	52.67	32.10	12.00	15		
	Over 40	56.50	35.00	16.26	2		
	(Overall)	53.24		10.57	62	6.46	.37

Appendix H (continued)

Category	Years of experience	Mean	Mean rank	S.D.	n	X^2	p
Actual policy	6-10	15.00	3.00	0.00	1		
	11-15	31.33	19.00	2.52	3		
	16-20	31.13	22.44	13.81	8		
	21-25	42.11	38.26	11.78	19		
	26-30	40.94	34.72	13.51	16		
	31-40	39.19	33.72	13.51	16		
	Over 40	43.50	41.75	6.36	2		
	(Overall)	38.88		13.05	65	8.72	.19
Desired policy	6-10	31.00	9.50	0.00	1		
	11-15	40.33	21.17	4.93	3		
	16-20	45.29	31.07	8.24	7		
	21-25	48.47	37.18	12.92	19		
	26-30	45.80	32.70	13.27	15		
	31-40	41.94	28.03	14.71	16		
	Over 40	50.00	40.00	8.49	2		
	(Overall)	45.21		12.66	63	5.26	.51

Appendix H (continued)

Category	Years of experience	Mean	Mean rank	S.D.	n	X^2	p
Actual curriculum/instruction	6-10	10.00	1.00	0.00	1		
	11-15	25.00	15.50	12.49	3		
	16-20	35.88	31.50	12.96	8		
	21-25	40.22	39.22	11.98	18		
	26-30	38.29	35.32	8.90	17		
	31-40	32.93	27.13	10.41	15		
	Over 40	36.00	33.50	2.83	2		
	(Overall)	36.14		11.48	64	9.39	.15
Desired curriculum/instruction	6-10	22.00	4.00	0.00	1		
	11-15	37.50	25.25	4.95	2		
	16-20	42.63	33.88	10.06	8		
	21-25	43.89	37.53	10.55	18		
	26-30	42.44	32.47	11.27	16		
	31-40	35.60	23.17	12.11	15		
	Over 40	45.50	42.50	0.71	2		
	(Overall)	40.84		11.20	62	8.72	.19

Appendix H (continued)

Category	Years of experience	Mean	Mean rank	S.D.	n	X^2	p
Actual pupil personnel	6-10	7.00	1.50	0.00	1		
	11-15	21.67	37.83	1.15	3		
	16-20	19.38	26.00	8.62	8		
	21-25	23.68	39.95	7.27	19		
	26-30	21.59	35.21	6.37	17		
	31-40	20.13	29.00	7.63	16		
	Over 40	21.00	33.25	1.41	2		
	(Overall)	21.33		7.20	66	7.37	.29
Desired pupil personnel	6-10	14.00	7.50	0.00	1		
	11-15	22.33	27.17	3.79	3		
	16-20	25.50	36.13	8.93	8		
	21-25	26.74	40.08	6.80	19		
	26-30	23.69	31.72	7.98	16		
	31-40	21.06	24.75	7.84	16		
	Over 40	29.50	51.00	2.12	2		
	(Overall)	24.12		7.67	65	9.95	.13

Appendix H (continued)

Category	Years of experience	Mean	Mean rank	S.D.	n	X^2	p
Actual staff personnel	6-10	29.00	6.00	0.00	1		
	11-15	49.33	33.00	3.51	3		
	16-20	38.83	23.08	17.03	6		
	21-25	46.81	29.28	12.56	16		
	26-30	46.67	27.43	16.45	15		
	31-40	49.13	32.53	15.59	15		
	Over 40	54.00	41.50	0.00	1		
	(Overall)	46.49		14.56	57	4.25	.64
Desired staff personnel	6-10	47.00	13.00	0.00	1		
	11-15	53.50	23.75	9.19	2		
	16-20	56.14	29.64	7.69	7		
	21-25	56.81	30.94	13.84	16		
	26-30	52.57	25.43	15.23	14		
	31-40	55.27	29.33	18.41	15		
	Over 40	62.00	37.00	0.00	1		
	(Overall)	55.05		14.35	56	2.28	.89

Appendix H (continued)

Category	Years of experience	Mean	Mean rank	S.D.	n	X^2	p
Actual school/community	6-10	22.00	33.00	0.00	1		
	11-15	17.50	19.50	4.95	2		
	16-20	17.88	19.75	9.63	8		
	21-25	24.11	34.17	7.36	18		
	26-30	24.19	33.66	8.34	16		
	31-40	24.44	35.13	9.12	16		
	Over 40	25.00	35.25	14.14	2		
	(Overall)	23.21		8.46	63	5.43	.49
Desired school/community	6-10	22.00	24.50	0.00	1		
	11-15	21.00	19.50	0.00	1		
	16-20	25.38	29.06	9.33	8		
	21-25	25.37	31.53	8.13	19		
	26-30	25.69	32.09	6.62	16		
	31-40	26.69	34.88	8.84	16		
	Over 40	28.00	34.50	12.73	2		
	(Overall)	25.75		7.89	63	1.29	.97

Appendix H (continued)

Category	Years of experience	Mean	Mean rank	S.D.	n	X^2	p
Actual parental involvement	6-10	7.00	3.00	0.00	1		
	11-15	13.00	28.00	2.65	3		
	16-20	12.38	24.63	4.44	8		
	21-25	15.00	35.42	4.77	19		
	26-30	14.35	30.91	5.44	17		
	31-40	16.25	41.50	5.63	16		
	Over 40	14.00	32.25	7.07	2		
	(Overall)	14.58		5.14	66	7.84	.25
Desired parental involvement	6-10	9.00	5.50	0.00	1		
	11-15	12.50	23.75	6.36	2		
	16-20	17.00	34.13	7.03	8		
	21-25	16.21	33.32	5.62	19		
	26-30	15.31	29.03	6.33	16		
	31-40	16.75	37.22	5.43	16		
	Over 40	15.00	30.50	5.66	2		
	(Overall)	15.95		5.82	64	4.30	.64

Appendix H (continued)

Category	Years of experience	Mean	Mean rank	S.D.	n	X^2	p
Actual staff development	6-10	12.00	6.00	0.00	1		
	11-15	22.00	35.83	4.36	3		
	16-20	19.25	30.50	7.42	8		
	21-25	21.33	34.83	4.27	18		
	26-30	20.88	32.56	6.17	16		
	31-40	19.13	30.06	7.74	16		
	Over 40	24.50	46.75	3.54	2		
	(Overall)	20.39		6.15	64	3.97	.68
Desired staff development	6-10	13.00	5.50	0.00	1		
	11-15	20.00	24.00	1.41	2		
	16-20	23.88	40.50	4.22	8		
	21-25	22.68	36.95	3.76	19		
	26-30	20.88	30.66	5.73	16		
	31-40	18.69	26.25	8.01	16		
	Over 40	24.50	45.00	3.54	2		
	(Overall)	21.20		5.83	64	7.99	.24

Appendix H (continued)

Category	Years of experience	Mean	Mean rank	S.D.	n	X^2	p
Actual budget	6-10	48.00	46.00	0.00	1		
	11-15	35.67	31.00	8.51	3		
	16-20	31.63	25.50	13.56	8		
	21-25	41.78	36.64	12.01	18		
	26-30	31.53	23.60	16.89	15		
	31-40	41.64	34.54	18.83	14		
	Over 40	38.00	29.50	28.28	2		
	(Overall)	37.57		15.70	61	6.79	.34
Desired budget	6-10	48.00	40.00	0.00	1		
	11-15	33.00	20.50	8.49	2		
	16-20	46.14	33.86	13.57	7		
	21-25	43.29	32.47	11.69	17		
	26-30	35.00	22.44	14.92	16		
	31-40	42.17	30.29	16.99	12		
	Over 40	42.50	30.25	27.58	2		
	(Overall)	40.77		14.44	57	4.90	.56

Appendix H (continued)

Category	Years of experience	Mean	Mean rank	S.D.	n	X^2	p
Actual plant management	6-10	24.00	36.50	0.00	1		
	11-15	17.00	23.17	3.00	3		
	16-20	18.50	22.94	9.97	8		
	21-25	24.94	35.72	9.96	18		
	26-30	23.63	30.94	13.17	16		
	31-40	28.63	36.72	16.23	16		
	Over 40	28.50	32.50	24.75	2		
	(Overall)	24.45		12.81	64	4.39	.62
Desired plant management	6-10	27.00	30.00	0.00	1		
	11-15	17.00	13.00	0.00	1		
	16-20	29.13	31.50	12.96	8		
	21-25	30.05	35.16	9.41	19		
	26-30	24.44	24.53	11.99	16		
	31-40	31.53	34.63	16.34	15		
	Over 40	34.00	39.00	16.97	2		
	(Overall)	28.71		12.54	62	5.04	.54

Appendix H (continued)

Category	Years of experience	Mean	Mean rank	S.D.	n	X^2	p
	School Board Chairpersons						
Actual planning	< 5	49.00	3.83	14.93	3		
	16-20	39.00	2.25	1.41	2		
	31-40	59.00	5.00	0.00	1		
	(Overall)	47.33		12.09	6	1.68	.43
Desired planning	< 5	55.33	4.67	9.45	3		
	6-10	57.00	5.00	0.00	1		
	16-20	39.00	1.50	1.41	2		
	31-40	60.00	6.00	0.00	1		
	(Overall)	51.57		10.33	7	4.04	.26
Actual policy	< 5	43.00	3.50	8.89	3		
	6-10	40.00	3.50	0.00	1		
	16-20	33.00	1.00	0.00	1		
	31-40	54.00	6.00	0.00	1		
	(Overall)	42.67		8.80	6	3.68	.30

Appendix H (continued)

Category	Years of experience	Mean	Mean rank	S.D.	n	X^2	p
Desired policy	< 5	53.00	4.00	2.65	3		
	6-10	43.00	2.00	0.00	1		
	16-20	33.00	1.00	0.00	1		
	31-40	63.00	6.00	0.00	1		
	(Overall)	49.67		10.46	6	4.43	.22
Actual curriculum/instruction	< 5	20.33	2.00	1.53	3		
	6-10	29.00	4.00	0.00	1		
	16-20	49.50	6.25	4.95	2		
	31-40	46.00	5.50	0.00	1		
	(Overall)	33.57		14.36	7	5.32	.15
Desired curriculum/instruction	< 5	33.00	3.00	17.35	3		
	6-10	36.00	2.00	0.00	1		
	16-20	49.50	5.50	4.95	2		
	31-40	52.00	6.00	0.00	1		
	(Overall)	40.86		13.59	7	3.32	.34

Appendix H (continued)

Category	Years of experience	Mean	Mean rank	S.D.	n	X^2	p
Actual pupil personnel	< 5	14.00	2.00	2.65	3		
	6-10	21.00	6.00	0.00	1		
	16-20	18.00	4.50	1.41	2		
	31-40	28.00	7.00	0.00	1		
	(Overall)	18.14		5.37	7	5.46	.14
Desired pupil personnel	< 5	18.00	3.83	4.00	3		
	6-10	14.00	1.50	0.00	1		
	16-20	18.00	4.00	1.41	2		
	31-40	29.00	7.00	0.00	1		
	(Overall)	19.00		5.23	7	3.35	.34
Actual staff personnel	< 5	38.00	3.33	5.00	3		
	6-10	42.00	4.00	0.00	1		
	16-20	31.00	1.00	0.00	1		
	31-40	60.00	6.00	0.00	1		
	(Overall)	41.17		10.38	6	3.67	.30

Appendix H (continued)

Category	Years of experience	Mean	Mean rank	S.D.	n	X^2	p
Desired staff personnel	< 5	50.00	2.50	4.95	2		
	6-10	59.00	4.00	0.00	1		
	16-20	31.00	1.00	0.00	1		
	31-40	62.00	5.00	0.00	1		
	(Overall)	50.60		12.34	5	3.80	.28
Actual school/community	< 5	22.00	2.67	7.55	3		
	6-10	24.00	3.00	0.00	1		
	16-20	28.50	5.50	4.95	2		
	31-40	30.00	6.00	0.00	1		
	(Overall)	25.29		6.00	7	3.18	.36
Desired school/community	< 5	26.67	2.83	5.86	3		
	16-20	28.50	4.00	4.95	2		
	31-40	31.00	4.50	0.00	1		
	(Overall)	28.00		4.65	6	.83	.66

Appendix H (continued)

Category	Years of experience	Mean	Mean rank	S.D.	n	X^2	p
Actual parental involvement	< 5	14.33	4.33	6.11	3		
	6-10	19.00	6.00	0.00	1		
	16-20	9.00	2.00	4.24	2		
	31-40	16.00	5.00	0.00	1		
	(Overall)	13.71		5.35	7	2.86	.41
Desired parental involvement	< 5	14.33	4.00	6.11	3		
	6-10	22.00	7.00	0.00	1		
	16-20	8.50	2.00	4.95	2		
	31-40	16.00	5.00	0.00	1		
	(Overall)	14.00		6.16	7	3.86	.28
Actual staff development	< 5	10.00	3.00	7.23	3		
	6-10	26.00	7.00	0.00	1		
	16-20	9.00	3.00	2.83	2		
	31-40	22.00	6.00	0.00	1		
	(Overall)	13.71		7.23	7	4.15	.25

Appendix H (continued)

Category	Years of experience	Mean	Mean rank	S.D.	n	X^2	p
Desired staff development	< 5	11.00	3.00	1.73	3		
	6-10	26.00	7.00	0.00	1		
	16-20	10.50	3.00	0.71	2		
	31-40	22.00	6.00	0.00	1		
	(Overall)	14.57		6.63	7	4.15	.25
Actual budget	< 5	43.33	3.33	7.61	3		
	16-20	39.50	2.50	3.54	2		
	31-40	57.00	6.00	0.00	1		
	(Overall)	44.33		7.61	6	2.45	.29
Desired budget	< 5	47.67	4.00	5.03	3		
	16-20	39.50	1.50	3.54	2		
	31-40	57.00	6.00	0.00	1		
	(Overall)	46.50		7.42	6	4.29	.12

Appendix H (continued)

Category	Years of experience	Mean	Mean rank	S.D.	n	X^2	p
Actual plant management	< 5	43.00	4.67	9.54	3		
	6-10	49.00	6.00	0.00	1		
	16-20	33.00	1.50	4.24	2		
	31-40	42.00	5.00	0.00	1		
	(Overall)	40.86		8.21	7	4.04	.26
Desired plant management	< 5	44.67	5.00	8.14	3		
	6-10	52.00	6.00	0.00	1		
	16-20	33.00	1.50	4.24	2		
	31-40	40.00	4.00	0.00	1		
	(Overall)	41.71		8.54	7	4.18	.24

* $\leq$ .05.

VITA

DONALD ALLEN ROGERS

Personal Data:	Date of Birth: January 22, 1948 Place of Birth: Washington County, Tennessee Marital Status: Married
Education:	Public Schools, Washington County and Unicoi County, Tennessee East Tennessee State University, Johnson City, Tennessee; business management, B.S., 1974 East Tennessee State University, Johnson City, Tennessee; educational administration and supervision, M.A., 1977 East Tennessee State University, Johnson City, Tennessee; Educational Specialist, 1979 East Tennessee State University, Johnson City, Tennessee; educational administration and supervision, Ed.D., 1994
Experience Teaching:	5th through 8th grades, Flag Pond, Rock Creek, and Temple Hill Elementary Schools, Unicoi County Schools, Erwin, Tennessee, 1974-1980
Experience in Administration:	Principal, Temple Hill Elementary, Erwin, Tennessee, 1976-1979 Tennessee Instructional Model Instructor, Unicoi County, 1985 Principal, Evans Elementary, Erwin, Tennessee, 1980-1990 Principal, Unicoi County Middle School, Erwin, Tennessee, 1991-1994 1991-1994
License and Certification Areas:	Career Ladder III, Administrator, 1985 Principalship K-8 Superintendent Elementary Teacher 1-9 Business Mathematics

Business English
Business Law
Business Machines
Government
Economics

Honors and Awards:

Meritorious Mast, United States Marine Corps, 1969
Honorable Discharge, United States Marine Corps, 1973
Phi Delta Kappa, Delta Sigma Pi, ETSU
Delta Sigma Pi, Chancellor, ETSU, 1974
Erwin Shrine Club, president, 1985
Lifetime PTA Award, 1990
First District Principals' Study Council, secretary, 1994
Tennessee Middle School, Principal of the Year, 1994

Service Organizations:

Kiwanis Club of Erwin
Shrine Club of Unicoi County
Masonic Lodge of Erwin
York Rite of Johnson City
Scottish Rite of Knoxville
Jericho Shrine Temple, Kingsport
Gideons, Erwin Camp